The Bible Champion

Volume XVIII. SEPTEMBER, 1914. Number 2

THE ARENA.

The Integrity of the Old Testament Historically and Critically Considered*

REV. WILLIAM H. BATES, D.D., WASHINGTON, D. C.

I.—Integrity Historically Considered.

This paper is to treat of the Integrity of the Old Testament, having reference, however, the rather to the integrity of separate Books than of the Old Testament as a whole. Let us pursue the subject along historical and critical lines.

DEFINITION.

By Integrity is meant unity, oneness. Of any literary production it may be asked, Is the work composed by one author? Is it one original, or is it a composite, derived from different authors? So, as to Old Testament books: Are they integral, or are they composite?

THE LOGICAL SITUATION.

In college days we had, in the study of logic, the phrase—*argumentum in possessorio*—by which it was understood that a given thesis did not need to justify itself, for it already had possession of its position by prescriptive right. It did not have to make good, for the argument was already in its favor, and whoever questioned it must make good his contention.

All through the centuries the integrity of the Pentateuch and of other Old Testament books has been claimed: they have had the *argumentum in possessorio*. Logically they are entitled to rest in that position until by compelling reasons from without they are forced to vacate it.

THE HISTORICAL SITUATION.

The present situation is just this: It has come to pass at the end of the centuries that a hostile force, led by a doughty warrior named Higher Criticism, is defying the armies of the living God, so to speak, and threateningly demands that the age-possessed position be unconditionally surrendered and evacuated.

Surely it is not unbecoming for us to inquire as to the reasons of this demand, whether they be conclusive or no. If we find them convincing, why, we will do what discretion dictates; if not, I trust we will still be discreet.

Let me observe that therefore I do not feel called upon to vindicate or champion the old claim, even if I were so disposed, but simply to interrogate the new-comer; and in so doing let me drop military phrase and speak, as is befitting, in the eirenic terms suited to this scholarly ministerial retreat.

The Higher Criticism.

Higher Criticism is itself simply a method of study. If the object of criticism is, as Matthew Arnold suggests, to "see and understand a literary production as it is in itself," surely the higher criticism should be a good thing. President King of Oberlin in his book, "Reconstruction in Theology," thus defines: "Higher Criticism may be defined as a careful historical and literary study of a book to determine its unity, age, authority, literary form and reliability" (p. 112). Our beloved brother Duncan of this Association thus defines: "Higher Criticism is that study which seeks to find out the time, place and circumstances when a writing was produced, and by whom it was written, and also the literary structure of the writing."

* A paper read before the Presbyterian Ministers' Association of Washington and Vicinity.

ITS METHOD.

As a form of study it employs three methods: theological, historical, and literary, the last most in evidence of them all, the others the outgrowth of, and dependent upon, the last. And there are two schools of this criticism: the Positive and Negative, or the Constructive and the Destructive. The destructive criticism has held not only the center, but pretty much the whole, of the stage, so that the popular mind knows little about any other; and it is, please note, with the destructive criticism mainly that we have now to do.

A PRODUCT.

The literary method of studying Old Testament books has analytically yielded what is called the Documentary Theory, according to which several of the books—the Pentateuch notably—are composite, made up of different documents. For instance, there is the E document by an Elohist, and the J document by a Jehovist, author. Then there is D by the Deuteronomist, and P by the Priestly, writer. These documents, by different authors, in different centuries it may be, have been taken by R, R^1, R^2, R^3, more or less—R being Redactor, compiler, editor—and fused into one straight story.

HALLUCINATION?

Professor Andrew C. Zenos of the McCormick (Presbyterian) Theological Seminary of Chicago, in an article on "Established Results of Old Testament Study," in the *Homiletic Review* for January, 1907, says: "The literary analysis into the documents known under the symbols J, E, D, P, is universally accepted" (p. 19), and he adds that it "has not been disproved, and does not seem capable of disproof." And another writer in the same *Review* a few months later says: "It can be said without much fear of contradiction that the conclusions—the great mass of them—of the modern critical study of the Bible are accepted by practically every Bible student of repute to-day, and will be the current thought of tomorrow" (August, 1907, p. 123).

If what these two gentlemen say is true, then the centuries-old claim of the integrity of Old Testament books cannot be true. In such a juncture it truly behooves us, in common speech, to sit up and take notice.

Let us bear in mind the logical situation: the Old has the field in possession, and should vacate it only by the compulsion of the truth of the opposite claim. It is not only fair, but we should feel ourselves obliged to ask, Is the documentary theory true? and, What are the grounds on which its truthfulness is claimed?

The Documentary Theory Under the Lens.

It may illuminate the subject and in a measure satisfy us as to the validity of the claims of this theory if we inquire into its parentage and trace somewhat its history.

THE UNSPEAKABLE ASTRUC.

Two hundred and thirty years ago, in Lauguedoc, France, one Jean Astruc (1684-1766) first saw the light. He was son of a Protestant pastor who, in the Roman Catholic persecutions consequent upon the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, recanted and entered the Roman Church. Jean studied at the great medical school of Montpellier, became a doctor at nineteen, and as practitioner, lecturer, professor, his fame was carried by his pupils throughout Europe. At the age of forty-five, wealthy and distinguished, he moved to Paris with his wife and children, where he immediately entered into the society that was admitted at the royal court. That was the court of Louis XIV, one of the most corrupt and licentious whose leprous story has polluted the pages of history. He became part of the concern. Seven years later he published his great medical work which brought him still more fame, *De Morbis Veneris*, a work made both appropriate and necessary by the sodomic set among which as court physician he practiced. Though still living with his family, he formed a connection with the most notorious woman of all Paris, the procuress of the court, and he maintained that illicit relation publicly for nineteen years, until her death. Voltaire, that "laughing devil" as he calls himself, describes Astruc as "Harpagon Astruc, debauchee, and possessed with a

devil." Between times, and probably to take the taste out of his mouth, he studied Scripture. In 1753, when he was sixty-nine years old, he published a work entitled "Conjectures Concerning the Original Memoranda which, it Appears, Moses Used to Compose the Book of Genesis, with Remarks which Support or Throw Light on These Conjectures." The book had this motto from Lucretius: "I pass through the remote regions of the Muses untrodden by other foot."

According to his scheme, Moses collected twelve different memoirs or fragments which he arranged first in twelve, and afterwards in four, columns, which were, by subsequent transcribers, blended into one narrative. Of course he had no historical evidence whatever on which to found this scheme,—not a bit. It was an invention, pure and simple, of his fertile fancy,—"conjectures" he himself says. But as a support, he appealed to the fact of the use of different names of Deity, "Elohim" and "Jehovah." Here was the beginning of the present exploited Documentary Theory.

HOW IT FARED.

Says Professor A. H. Sayce, of Oxford: "Astruc's theory of the composition of Genesis was silently dropped by those who came after him, but his idea that the different names applied to Deity in the Book of Genesis signified different documents, was taken up and elaborated." The man to do this was Professor John G. Eichhorn (1752-1827), the distinguished oriental scholar of Jena, Germany. Thirty years after the publication of Astruc's "Conjectures" he took up the cue of the different Hebrew names for God noted by the Frenchman, devised a method of making this and other literary phenomena a basis of conclusions in regard to the original composition and authorship of books of Scripture. This method he was the first to call "higher criticism," and he has been called the "Father of the Higher Criticism," although that sobriquet really belongs to Jean Astruc.

OTHER "THEORIES."

Professor Zenos, in his book "Elements of the Higher Criticism," says: "Outside of Germany Astruc and Eichhorn met with little favor" (p. 196); and then he goes on to trace changes that have followed. He notes next what is called the Fragment Theory (p. 197), in which J. S. Vater, a German scholar, discovers that Genesis is composed of thirty-eight fragments! Then comes what is called the Supplement Theory of De Wette (p. 199); then Ewald's Crystallization Theory (p. 201); etc., and so on. I cannot speak of these theories in detail, but I may say that each one had its variations, the variations varying with the intellectual versatility of the numerous men who considered the theories. And all this in the name of "scholarship"!

I COR. XIII. ILLUSTRATED.

It could be wished that these seekers after truth—which of course they all were—had been as heavenly-minded and sweet-spirited as becomes those engaged in such a laudable undertaking. As an illustration of the lovely amenities that grace the destructive higher critical scholarship, Ewald calles the Tubingen professor, Bauer, "no Christian at all, but worse than a heathen" (Life of Philip Schaff, p. 21). Bauer returns the missile by calling Ewald's periodical the "Magazine of Theological Passion," in place of "Magazine of Biblical Science," its real name. Why, the boulders that some of these beloved brethren heave at each other would make Bret Harte's chunks of old red sandstone that interrupted the proceedings of the Stanislaus Society seem, in comparison, like pellets of dough. Sometimes a pair of these combatants remind me of the two belligerent serpents that are said to have commenced head to tail to swallow each other, and when they got through there wasn't anything left of either! To a spectator with a bit of a strain of sporting blood in him, it is interesting to watch and see the fun go on.

Standing on the edge of these tumultuous scenes, we may bewilderingly look around and ask, Where are we? A little schoolgirl in England was asked to write an essay on wild animals and the countries they inhabit. She wrote: "Wild animals used to abound in England, but now they are only to be found in theological gardens." We seem to be in a theological zoo!

TAB KEPT.

All truth is one, harmonious; but the higher critical output, as we have thus seen it, is exceedingly multiple, and to a degree antagonistic. The late Dr. Mendenhall, editor of the *Methodist Review,* kept track of the theories he saw applied, since 1850, to the origin and authorship of the Books of the Bible, by the higher critics. To the Old Testament books, 539; to the New, 208: total 747. He says: "Of the 747 theories, 603 are defunct, and many of the remaining 144 are in the last stages of degeneracy and dissolution." I think I would like something a little more dependable to rest upon. Wouldn't you?

Such is our tracing of history.

II.—Integrity Critically Considered.

Having taken this brief, but perhaps sufficient, historical survey, let us now pursue our investigations along critical lines.

THE CLAIM.

Astruc, as we have seen, was the first to call attention to the use of the different names for God—Elohim and Yahweh or Jehovah. He was entirely right as to the fact, but the inference that has followed, the assumption that has been built thereupon, the claim that has been deduced therefrom, viz., that those different names prove a difference of authorship—that is altogether another thing.

THE CLAIM WITHOUT PROOF.

Do you ask what evidence is offered in support of the claim? I answer: Not one particle of external evidence whatever. And the reason why it is not offered is because there is absolutely none to offer. As a matter of fact—and let this be noted well—the name Jehovah is found in the alleged E documents, and Elohim is found in the alleged J documents, and these are used singly and in combination. Of course this is contrary to what the original theory requires, and so, to account for the fact, the agile critics have been obliged to break up the J, E, D, and P documents into J^1, J^2, J^3, E^1, E^2, E^3, and so on; and for aught I see the way is open to raise these symbols to the *nth* power. Professor Briggs furnishes twelve "sources," Cornill eighteen, Wellhausen twenty, Vater, as we have seen, thirty-eight; and if you want more you can just "help yourself."

THE CLAIM DISPROVED.

In the *Homiletic Review* for August and September, 1898, were two articles on "Elohim and Jehovah in the Pentateuch," by the late Professor W. H. Green of Princeton, who was chairman of the American Old Testament Revision Committee. He went through the entire Pentateuch, took up each occurrence of these names and gave a good and sufficient reason why in each instance one name was used rather than the other. At the close of the first article he said, what he could just as pertinently have said at the close of the second: "An examination of the facts thus far has shown that the critical hypothesis of different documents is not required to explain the different uses of the Divine names, and is not in accord with that use. It proposes a superficial, mechanical, and unsatisfactory solution, while it overlooks or disregards the real key to the whole matter, which readily offers itself, in the signification and use of the words themselves." And he elsewhere says that this theory finds no support in the Pentateuch itself, but is "simply the creation of learned ingenuity and a lively imagination" ("The Unity of the Book of Genesis," p. 7).

THE CLAIM ABSURD.

Let me give you on the blackboard two illustrations showing the absurdity of this compilation theory, which I take from Bacon's "Genesis of Genesis" and Bissell's "Genesis Printed in Colors."

Genesis xxi. 1.

J "And the Lord visited Sarah as he said,
P and
R the Lord
P did unto Sarah as he had spoken."

Gen. xxxvii. 2, 3.

P "These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph being seventeen years old,
[———]

E was feeding the flock with his brethren; and he was a lad
E^2 with the sons of Billah, and with the sons of Zilpah, his father's wives;
E and Joseph brought the evil report of them unto their father.
J Now Israel loved Joseph," etc.

The brackets indicate, according to Professor Bacon, "missing material," something that R, the Redactor, ought to have put in, but didn't. I don't know what you think about it, but for myself I am quite of the mind of Professor Galusha Anderson at the Chicago University commencement, who, sandwiched between President Harper and Professor Northrup, made a notable address considering his "environment," and said: "No mortal man who ever put two ideas together ever wrote that way since the foundation of this world."

THE CLAIM IMPOSSIBLE.

Perhaps you have read books that were the joint work of more than one author, for instance, the English novels of Besant and Rice, or the French stories of Erckmann and Chatrian. I do not know that any one has ever dared to undertake to tell where Besant ends and Rice begins, or where Erckmann leaves off and Chatrian takes up the tale. And yet we are asked to believe that men to-day can pick out and properly assign to different authors, paragraphs, sentences, phrases, and even single words, in literary productions written thousands of years ago in a language as dead as an Egyptian mummy and as desiccated as the sands of Sahara! *Non Possumus*, which being freely translated means, You can't do it—impossible!

NO EVIDENCE?

Still you insist, I fancy, on asking—and very properly—Where *do* they get evidence for their assumptions? I answer: They get it just where naturalists tell us spiders get their webs—out of their own inwardness: there and nowhere else.

"The creation of learned ingenuity and a lively imagination," says Professor Green.

Professor George H. Schodde, of Columbus, Ohio—than whom perhaps no one in this country is better acquainted with German religious thought, its contents, currents and cross-currents—speaking of the Old Testament reconstruction scheme, says: "It is undeniably a purely subjective production, without a scintilla of external evidence, being founded solely upon subjective analysis and combination."

Says the lecturer in Hebrew at Columbia College, New York City: "Much of the higher criticism is mere guesswork, is based upon insufficient premises, and owes its surroundings largely to imagination."

Says Dr. James, head-master of Rugby: "I am bound to say that my own study of it has convinced me that a great deal of this criticism is absolutely indefensible. . . . I do not believe that the claims made nowadays to cut up the various books into four or five different parts, and to allocate one particular passage to one writer and another to another . . . can be substantiated, or can be paralleled in the case of any other ancient literature with which I am acquainted."

Says Dr. Eerdmans, recently inducted as successor to the higher critic, as he had been a pupil of, Professor Kuenen: "Personally, I am convinced that critics are on the wrong track, and that we shall never be able to explain the composite character of the Hexateuch"—(i. e., the Pentateuch plus the Book of Joshua)—"if we do not do away with Jahvistic, Elohistic, and priestly writers, which are indicated by J^2, E^2, P^2, etc."

GUYING THE CRITICS.

Let me tell you a story. There came out in Germany a book entitled "Romans Dissected." It purported to have been written by one Professor McRealsham. The name suggests a Germanized Scotchman. Critical analysis shower four well-marked divisions, or sources, from which the Bible book was compiled. In one, Christ is spoken of as Jesus Christ, which would give a J C document; in another as Christ Jesus, which would give the document C J; in another he is spoken of as God, but as this was subdivided for an alleged sufficient reason, there were yielded the documents G^1 and G^2. Thus there were derived G^1, G^2, J C and C J. The evidence was presented in minute detail, and the demon-

stration seemed complete — as perfect as that for any Pentateuchal analysis. The "scholars" bit. The book was hailed with delight, and it was declared to mark a great step in the progress of higher criticism. In a second edition it was translated into English, and the facts came out. And who is Professor McRealsham? He is the late Professor Charles M. Mead of the Hartford (Conn.) Theological Seminary. He wrote the book as a take off, a joke, to show the absurdity, the groundlessness, of the claims of the higher criticism. It was a real sham. His achievement was a fiue exhibition of what "learned ingenuity and a lively imagination" can do.

THE NORM OF CRITICISM.

It would seem plain, therefore, that the source of higher critical evidence is only internal, subjective; or if you wish other phraseology, it comes from literary insight, instinct, taste. If any are inclined to discount the foregoing testimonies adduced, as from men not over friendly to higher criticism, let me cite Professor Eichhorn himself, who is the bright particular star in the higher critical firmament. He speaks of Critics as "Experts in fine appreciation of the Hebrew language who have long accustomed themselves to distinguish the fine differences of expression and ideas in ancient writers"; and he says "The most convincing passages can only be felt." That is, if you "feel," if your literary instinct, if your "fine appreciation," says that such a chapter, paragraph, line, word, belongs to such an author, at such a date, under such and such circumstances, why, it is so!

HOW THE NORM WORKS.

Let Eichhorn himself show how reliable the critical faculty is. Through his "fine appreciation of the Hebrew language"— and he had it if any one has—he pronounced it unthinkable that Isaiah could have written chapters fifteen and sixteen of the book that bears his name; yet thirteen years later, by that very same "fine appreciation," he quietly assigns these identical chapters back to Isaiah! Emerson says, "Hitch your wagon to a star." I prefer to have my vehicle *not* hitched to such a variable star as that!

Higher Criticism's Two-fold Foundation.

The Critics have predicated for higher criticism a two-fold basis: 1. The use of the different Divine names implying a difference of authorship and so different documents; 2. The late use of writing for literary purposes.

The first we have considered and found it worthless. Let us now glance at the second.

THE SECOND FOUNDATION.

In 1795, forty-two years after the publication of Astruc's "Conjectures," Friedrich August Wolf (1759-1824), professor in the University of Halle, Germany, published his *Prolegomena* to Homer, in which, assuming that writing was unknown in the reputed Homeric times, he taught that the Iliad and the Odyssey could not have been produced by Homer, but they were made up of ballads, troubador songs, and the like, sung memoriter by wandering minstrels, the collection being made by Pisistratus about 520 B. C., who reduced them to writing and put them into form. Thus Homer was not a single person, but a name which stood for a golden age of the true spontaneous poetry of genius and nature. For more than fifty years after Wolf's publication the assumption of the late date of writing was one which nobody who pretended to critical scholarship ventured to dispute. Indeed, in the school days of some of us still living, we used to hear the belief in the existence of the man Homer derided as "uncritical" and "unscholarly."

The application of the Wolfian theory to the Old Testament is plain. If writing for literary purposes was unknown until the time of Pisistratus, i. e., until the time of the Jewish exile and the later Old Testament prophets, of course none of the books of the Pentateuch could have been written by Moses nearly a thousand years before; and other early literature of the Old Testament could not have been brought into existence at the date traditionally attributed to it, but had its production at the late period which this theory demands.

THIS FOUNDATION A QUICKSAND.

The excavator's spade has been busy in these late years, and it has dug the graves of many figments that were thought to have been very much alive. Recent archæological "finds" have not only revolutionized our conceptions of the history of far ancient times, but have made the assumption of the ancient illiteracy of the Orient an impossibility. John Fiske of Harvard says that if Wolf were alive he would be the first to laugh at his own theory. Says the eminent archæologist, Sayce, in that wonderfully informing little book of his, "Monumental Facts and Higher Critical Fancies": "We have learnt many things of late years from archæology, but its chiefest lesson has been that the age of Moses, and even that of Abraham, was almost as literary an age as our own" (p. 43). "The Mosaic age, therefore, instead of being an illiterate one, was one of high literary activity and education throughout the civilized East" (p. 40). "Not only could the Hebrew leader have compiled a code of laws; we now see it would have been incredible had he not done so" (p. 71). "Wherever archæology has been able to test the negative conclusions of criticism, they have dissolved like a bubble into the air" (p. 25). "In the 'critical' theory of the origin of the Biblical narrative archæology thus compels us to see only a philological mirage" (p. 53).

In the July *Homiletic Review*, 1907, Professor Sayce has an article, "The Documentary Theory of the Pentateuch: a Test Case," in which he treats the theory from the historical and the theological standpoints. His conclusion from the first is: "The documentary theory of the Pentateuch on the historical side thus rests on an exploded assumption" (p. 10), and from the second, "As the second alternative given above is a chronological impossibility, it follows that the documentary theory breaks down under the first scientific test that can be applied to it" (p. 12).

THE TWO-FOLD FOUNDATION VANISHES.

In the light of what has thus been adduced, I think it may be clearly seen that the two-fold basis for the higher criticism has no real foundation whatever in fact, but is the worthless product — to use the words of Professor Schodde—of "subjective analysis and combination," or—to use again the words of Professor Green—of "learned ingenuity and a lively imagination." Therefore, whatever of structure is built upon it must, since truth is truth, sooner or later collapse. It can only be kept up, if it shall be kept up, by what Professor Schaff denominates certain Teutonic speculations to be—"intellectual balloonings."

BLUFF CALLED.

It is therefore submitted that we are consequently entitled to conclude that the surrender-challenge of our doughty warrior is a bluff, and the threat to compel evacuation of the age-possessed position is an empty boast.

NO SURRENDER.

As was said at the outset, I did not feel called upon to vindicate or champion the old claim of Integrity: I simply proposed to interrogate the new-comer as to the reasons for his capitulation-demands. We have not found them to be conclusive or convincing, but quite the contrary. There are, to be sure, signs that some slight explanatory notes, here and there, on the margin of an old manuscript, have, by a later transcriber, been placed in the body of the text; but plainly the old claim of the integrity of the Old Testament books still has the *argumentum in possessorio*. Discretion denies the dictate to surrender.

HALLUCINATION OR WORSE.

It would seem, then, that Professor Zenos' claim that the documentary theory is now "universally accepted" is an hallucination of exceedingly diaphanous tenuity. And the other assertion that "the conclusions of the modern critical study of the Bible are accepted by practically every Bible student of repute to-day" would be ridiculous if it were not so insolent. So multitudinous and vociferous have been the shoutings that all the scholarship is on the side of the new views, the public ear has been almost deafened to any other voice.

DEMENTIA?

Thomas Wentworth Higginson, in his book "Part of a Man's Life," says: "Agassiz, in the height of the Darwinian contro-

versy, denied that there was any division on the subject among scientific men, on the ground that any man who accepted the doctrine of evolution ceased thereby to be a man of science" (p. 129). Does saying that no man of science accepts the doctrine of evolution, make it so? No more does saying that all the scholars hold the modern critical views of the Bible make it so.

OH, THE "SCHOLAR"!

Before a St. Louis suburban club to which I belonged, a Jewish Rabbi delivered a notable address on "The Bible In the Light of Modern Thought," in which he said that to hold the old views was "impossible to a scholar"—with emphasis heavy on *scholar*. The previous year at the Presbyterian General Assembly, when the case of Professor McGiffert was up, which involved the question of the old and the new views, the entire Assembly—the roll showed over 700 delegates—rose to its feet in irrepressible enthusiasm voting unanimously in favor of the report which sustained the old views as against the New York professor. And the Presbyterians are not popularly placed second in the matter of Christian scholarship. This frequent assumption that the consensus of scholarship is all one way, reminds me of a political campaign skit. A man up in Wisconsin wanted to contract with the hotels at the summer resorts to deliver a carload of frogs' legs. He could do it, for the ponds and lakes were full of batrachians, as he knew by the noise they made. He fulfilled his contract with a market basket. They made up in noise what they lacked in numbers.

Shakespeare tells of an offense the malodorousness of which was so rank that it smelled to heaven. Here is another—this disgusting all-scholar talk.

FOR THE OLD VIEW.

If I may give, in closing, a word in sympathy with the old view of the Pentateuchal integrity, let me cite Professor G. Frederick Wright of Oberlin, who is in the very forefront of scholarship in this country as a scientist and theologian. In an article in *The Congregationalist* he says: "I have examined between thirty and forty of the most carefully selected proofs of the higher critics that Moses was not the substantial author of the Pentateuch, and I confess that I find very little in them that is not perfectly compatible with the Mosaic authorship, so that the general impression made upon my mind by the continuous and fresh perusal of the book is stronger than ever in favor of its Mosaic origin."

And again: The editor of *The Sunday School Times*, after considering the views of Sir J. William Dawson, president of the British Association, than whom probably no man stands higher in the English-speaking world, says: "His conclusions justify any reverent Bible student to accept unhesitatingly the narrative in Genesis as veritable history presented in its present shape by a divinely inspired writer; and this in the face of every attempt to show that the myths and the folklore of the nations were the source of the Bible narrative."

Let us understand, then, that notwithstanding all the critical assaults upon the Bible, we may continue to receive it as it has been received, the Word of God, standing unscathed in its integrity, reliability, and divine authority.

Ad Clerum.

Will you, brethren, kindly permit a final word of appeal?

It is said that in the cordage of the British navy there runs a red thread through every rope. There is a red thread — the blood-red thread of redemption — that runs straight through the Bible from the first chapter of Genesis to the last chapter of the Apocalypse. The saddest outcome of the destructive criticism is its disastrous effect upon Christian thought and life. It dethrones Jesus as the atoning, redeeming Saviour of the world, and shatters into fragments the cross of Christ.

There is an old legend of an enchanted cup filled with a poisoned draught, that was treacherously put into the hand of a king. He signed over it the sign of the cross, and it shivered in his grasp. Whatever view of the Sacred Scriptures or whatever theory regarding them the cross of Christ would shatter, *that* reject, instantly reject.

In the magnificent temples of the East, it is said, there is a spot just beneath the great dome where, inlaid in the pavement, is a cross, and from that central spot can be seen all the grandeur and all the beauty of the sacred edifice. The one grand center of the Bible—Old Testament and New—is the cross of Christ, and from that center can its grandeur and beauty be seen, and only from that point can its meaning be understood. Whatever teaching concerning the Holy Book would blot out that center, or even shift its position, let me again say reject, instantly reject.

Professor Bertram C. A. Windle, M.A., M.D., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S., President of Queen's College, Cork, said:

"I entirely agree with you that there is no real antagonism between the facts of Science and Religion as properly understood. Also I can assure you that there are quite a number of men who might fairly claim to have done a reasonable amount of work who are also firm believers in the truths of Christianity." From his lecture on "Some Debts Which Science Owes to Catholics," the following items are taken:

"There are five of these units," he says in speaking of electricity, "the Volt, the Ampere, the Coulomb, the Ohm, and the Farad. Each of them is the whole or the part of a man's name. We may dispose of the Ohm, which is the unit of resistance, and of Farad, which is that of capacity, since neither Ohm, nor that great man, Machael Faraday, were Catholics. But all the other three belong to us." Turning to another branch of science the professor said:

"Everybody has heard of the Roentgen rays, and most people have either seen them or at least the radiographs which they produce, but probably few know that the discoverer of these rays is a faithful son of the Church." With regard to Pasteur and his work: "No sane person doubts the great scientific interest and the enormous practical importance of Pasteur's work. Nor does any person who knows anything about him doubt the sincerity of his attachment to the Catholic faith." Touching the origin of life:

"So much for this great controversy, in which, as I have tried to show, Catholic names have been prominent from the earliest to the latest times, for Mr. Butler Burke, the author of the latest unsuccessful attempt to prove abiogenesis, is also a member of our faith." With regard to Mendel, the great biologist of "Mendel's Law" fame, he says:

"But who, after all, is this Mendel of whom there is so much talk, around whose discoveries or theories all this scientific controversy rages? Well, Mendel was a monk, and ended his days as Abbot of the Augustinian Abbey of Brun, and it was in the gardens of this abbey that his classical experiments were carried out."

THE BIBLE AS AN EDUCATOR.

In his address to the British Educational Conference Viscount Bryce deplored the increasing unfamiliarity of school children with the Bible. Undoubtedly in this age of religious relaxation and education in non-sectarian schools and colleges boys and girls are grounded in the Bible to only a very moderate extent. The old contact with it in the family circle is gone, and the Sunday School is about the only agency left through which the younger generation gets its knowledge of the Bible, either as doctrine or as literature.

It is not extravagant to say that the loss of such knowledge would be a great misfortune, looking at it only from the educational point of view. The English language as employed in the King James version rises to a dignity and harmony in prose and to an exquisite balance between vigor and beauty which attains nowhere else. To cut off a pupil in the formative years from access to that masterpiece of expression is to deprive him of an almost indispensable standard by which to measure the power and purity of the English tongue.

Happy is the old-fashioned boy or girl who went unwillingly to family worship or struggled half heartedly with the Prayer Book or Westminister Catechism. In educational value alone the bread thus cast in travail of spirit upon the waters has returned to feed him or her abundantly in later years.

The Crime of Higher Criticism.*

Rev. J. W. Mendenhall, LL.D.

Editor, *Methodist Review,* November, 1890.

The home of the "higher criticism" is Germany. It has residences in France, Switzerland, Austria, England, Scotland, and the United States; but if one would study it in its original aspects, and discover its power of metamorphosis to suit its necessities, one must visit the German universities and confer with those critics who are recognized as leaders both in the assault upon, and in the defense of, the word of God. In a qualified sense we have a profound respect for the German scholars who are theorizing out of existence the historic standards of the Church; they are erudite, patient, devoted to method, and self-sacrificing in their labors; and, what is more to their credit, they are *original,* disdaining to be borrowers or tinkers of other men's ideas. Of Renan in Paris, Kuenen in Leyden, and a few others in other lands, we may write the same commendation; but as a class the high critics of other countries are wholesale borrowers of German theories, arguments, and speculations. It is this fact that leads us to deride the so-called scholarship of other countries in its defense and elaboration of negative criticism. It walks on stilts and shouts through a German tube, causing even the Germans to laugh at the dwarfs who wish to be taken for giants in the great conflict between truth and error.

Granting to German criticism an originality that dignifies it, an intensity that guarantees it wide-spread influence, and a scholarly force that lifts it above cheapness and vulgarity, we have some things to write against it; or rather, we prefer to say, that as we have studied it in the presence of its leaders we have discovered in their methods and purposes some things that from an evangelical viewpoint cannot be justified or even explained. The testing-time has not yet fully come, but it will come. If it shall be shown in the future that the "higher criticism" has been dishonest in its methods and disastrous in its results, it will have a terrible responsibility to render to the truth; but if, on the other hand, it can sustain itself, it may boast of having rendered some service to human thought and some aid to theology and religion. We shall endeavor in this article to exhibit its spirit, its methods, and its conclusions, leaving the reader to infer whether its work is in the evangelical line or contrary to those historic conclusions that the Church for ages has accepted.

We now observe, that the *radical critic has worked without any sense of barrier, either as to his method or conclusions.* He seems to have forgotten that he was under any obligation to respect the laws of literature or the spirit of religion. He commenced his investigations as an Ishmaelite, warring against all views merely because they had regulated the faith of mankind, and contradicting the essentials of history because they were authentic and all-powerful. He was reckless beyond description, and theoretic even when facts warned him against speculation. He never acknowledged the restraints of law, religion, or the literary spirit, and worked as if he had a divine commission to uproot what the Church had planted. He was irreverent from choice, and ridiculed when silence would have dignified his negativism. He went forward, therefore, in an irreverent, reckless manner, reaching inconclusive results, and standing for them as if they had behind them the demonstration of irrevocable certainties.

In no department of literature has there been such an exhibition of irreverence toward facts, of recklessness of method in

* It may not be improper to state that last summer we visited Europe chiefly for the purpose of investigating the critical biblical questions that have been and are still in discussion between conservative and rationalistic critics. We were favored with extended interviews with thirty-one of the prominent professors in Germany and eight professors in England, besides numerous interviews with other scholars in those countries and in Scotland and France. We have been amply rewarded for the effort made to gain a personal knowledge of the critics and of the arguments upon which their theories are based. In this and succeeding articles we shall avail ourselves of the rich material obtained in this way.

investigation, and of obstinacy for ill-founded conclusions as has occurred in the realm of German criticism. Gibbon was not as ferocious as Graf, Hume not as illogical as Wellhausen, Bolingbroke not as circumscribed as Pfleiderer, Porphyry not as unreasonable as Socin and Stade. We cannot appreciate the irreverent and reckless methods of the critics by a generalization, nor does space allow particulars to any great extent; but it will assist the reader in his study of the subject if we remind him that they have been entirely unscrupulous in regard to fixed points of sacred history, and totally blind as to the facts of sacred biography. They commence in their investigations as their fancies or theories require, perfectly oblivious of the dates, epochs, books, and Hebrew leaders who may have been associated with the great events of the Jewish cycles. They handle the Bible in the interest of their theories, and everything in it is made to support them or is rejected. It is the deceitful investigation of the Bible that is a characteristic of the higher criticism. Pfleiderer commences his *History of Israel* with Samuel, repudiating all the Pentateuchal history as either legendary and delusive, or at the most uncertain and improper in national annals. Stade repudiates the pre-Mosaic history and denies the historical character of Abraham. Wellhausen builds upon the seventh century and upon a single alleged fact in Israel's career a theory that compels in his judgment the late origin of the biblical books. Socin denies the truthfulness of the book of Exodus. And Dillman, urging that writing was unknown in the time of Moses, a view overthrown by Ewald, and recently proved fallacious by the late Professor Wright of Cambridge, and Professor Sayce of Oxford, insists that he wrote no portion of the Pentateuch. Nearly every critic holds a different view and has a different starting point. *He may begin a priori, or a posteriori, anywhere, any time, with anybody in Israel's history, tear down, pluck out, or do anything that his preconceived theory requires.* If he does nothing else, he indulges in what Job says he could gather, a "heap of words." Hitherto there has been no restraint, and the result has been a conglomerate of theories, absurd, impracticable, irrational in form if not blasphemous in spirit, the whole subversive of faith in the so-called system of revelation. Under this influence the critics have proposed all sorts of biblical reconstructions, especially of history and prophecy, and have affirmed that in the interest of the human race they have delivered the Bible from the bondage of the Church. The destructive spirit has met a check in the sense of limitation the most advanced radicals have reached; in the cogent answers of the conservative party; and in the self-evident disagreement among the critics themselves, who are destroying one another as rapidly as the printing-press can publish their mutual antagonisms.

"Higher criticism" in Germany may properly be designated the new rationalism, for it differs from the old rationalism in little else than name. Not a critic, however, assumes to be a rationalist in any sense, because it strikes at his intellectual sobriety, and implies that he has lost his reckoning in the search for truth. This is an incidental proof that Germany is veering toward the right side of faith; but it is a fact that Dillmann, Pfleiderer, Wellhausen, Merx, Socin, Kautzsch, Meyer, Stade, and the extreme critics generally are spoken of as rationalists all over Germany. They differ too little from Semler, De Wette, Baur, Strauss, and the elder school to claim separation from them, except that, while the older rationalists confined themselves to one object and were narrow in their researches and proofs, the critics of to-day, unrestrained by any considerations whatever, have exceeded them in the breadth of their investigations and the length of their conclusions. The Bible survived the narrow rationalism of the elder school; it has required all the resources of Christian scholarship to resist the critical attacks of the new school upon its historical integrity and supernatural character. The old rationalism aimed to eliminate the miraculous element in the Scriptures, but either conceded the truth of the remaining portions or rejected them because compromised by alleged association with legendary events and incidents. The new rationalism, in-

stead of investigating or discussing the supernatural element, ignores it, and so disposes of it without examination; an easier method than that of Semler and De Wette. The one school discussed it out of existence, the other school banishes it from its realm of investigation.

In either case the result is the same—the supernatural element is without recognition. On this point this is the exact difference between the old and the new rationalism.

The new rationalism proposed for its object the investigation of the origin of the biblical books. It was not unreasonable to inquire if Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or under what historical conditions Isaiah inbreathed his prophecies, or whether the book of Daniel really originated with the prophet, or whether John wrote the fourth gospel, or whether Mark's was the first gospel, or if Paul really wrote the letters to Timothy. No scholar objects to these inquiries any more than he objects to such questions as whether Livy wrote the fragmentary books that have come down to us, or whether Xenophon wrote his *Anabasis,* or Aristotle his works, or Pliny his *Letters.* Such inquiries are innocent enough, plausible enough, and may be propounded by minds the most devout; and so far as methods are involved, in the same way in the realm of sacred as in profane literature. If the higher critic did nothing more than to press his inquiry for the origin of the Pentateuch, or that of the Psalms, or that of the Prophetical Books, we should not only not pronounce him a rationalist, but join him in his uncovering the hidden facts of authorship; yet the Baur school of rationalists concerned itself more with the origin of the Pauline epistles than anything else, and Renan has expended his richest imagination on demolishing Paul as an author. We are quite willing, however, to suspend the application of the hateful word to modern critics until we follow them into the intricacies of their work and discover the ultimatum of their inquiries.

In our investigation of German theories we have been pained to find that the *origin* of the biblical books, at first the chief question, is now simply incidental, and that the gist of criticism is the overthrow of the biblical system of revelation. It were easy to furnish abundant proof of the departure of the critics from their original purpose, and to show that the question of authorship or the investigation of the literary history of the books has been superseded by the larger question of the truthfulness of the biblical record and the value of the biblical system.

As an explanation of the wide range of criticism it will be urged that the one question of origin implies all collateral questions, and that the whole system rises or falls with the determination of the origin of the books. Had the critics advertised their scheme in the beginning it had been understood; but no conservative scholar suspected that the word "origin" was a Trojan horse full of all menace to the citadel of truth. It seems, however, that in pursuing the one end the critics, at first quietly but latterly openly, have been striking at nearly all the fundamental questions of revelation, deciding these even more readily than the original question with which they commenced. They not only sit in judgment on the authorship of the Pentateuch, but they *impeach the veracity of its contents;* they not only empty the prophetical books of inspiration, but *renounce the predictive character of the Messianic visions;* declaring that Christ was in no sense an intended fulfilment of them; they not only destroy faith in the historic authorship of the books, but take pleasure in showing their anonymous character, thereby opening the door to all kinds of speculation respecting their value and meaning; they not only eliminate the supernatural, but also eliminate such portions of the historical as do not conform to their theories or contribute to the ends of destructionism. They not only divide books, displace dates, and argue authors out of existence, but they *abolish* books, and mutilate the Old Testament by such a process of reconstruction of the remainder as to deprive it of recognition as the "Scripture from which our Lord and his apostles quoted." In dealing with the New Testament they are as reckless in assault, as daring in maneuver, and as careless of consequences as in their attempts upon the Old Testament. In

addition to the simple question of origin of the New Testament books they push into an examination of its contents, challenging its teaching and undermining faith in the religion they embody. It is not enough with them to declare that John did not write the fourth gospel, nor Paul many of the epistles that bear his name; they reject the doctrine of the incarnation, the doctrine of Christ's sacrifice, the doctrine of the resurrection, the doctrine of regeneration, and the doctrine of a divine system of religion. In summing up the positions of the critics we have been led to conclude that: 1. They have gone far beyond the purpose of ascertaining the literary origin of the Bible; 2. They have gone far beyond the elder rationalists in their investigation and surpassed them in the ruin they sought to achieve. Are they not, therefore, rationalists of a most dangerous type?

(To be continued.)

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

The Bibliotheca Sacra is to be congratulated upon its long and brilliant career. It has no superior in the character of the subjects treated, and for the intellectual ability and literary rank of its contributors. The editor, G. Frederick Wright, LL.D., alone, is enough to make the Quarterly one of the foremost leaders of the world in the realm which has commanded the interest and labor of his whole life. THE BIBLE CHAMPION is not only highly honored, but greatly favored in entering upon its work under the new name and under the direction of its new Board of Directors in being associated with *The Bibliotheca Sacra*. All new subscribers to *The Bibliotheca Sacra* may secure both magazines for one year for $3.00. This should be paid in advance and sent to THE BIBLE CHAMPION.

"As regards the statement that 'recent scientific research has shown the Bible and Religion to be untrue,' nothing is further from the real fact; the more the Bible is tested the more it is found to be made up of historical documents. Moreover, it is recognized that the Bible, as a record of truth, never falls foul of Science in its search after truth, and scientific men are too true to themselves to take the stand that they will not accept truth of any kind."—*Prof. G. Sims Woodhead, M.S.*, Professor of Pathology in the University of Cambridge, since 1889; Editor of the *Journal of Pathology and Bacteriology*.

The Continent-wide Campaign can begin at once if each Subscriber will get another. DO IT NOW!

"In philosophy, in physics, and in astronomy I am content to place myself by the side of Bacon, of Newton, of Napoleon. I believe with Bacon, that 'a little Philosophy inclineth Mans Minde to Atheisme; but depth in Philosophy bringeth Men's Mindes about to Religion.' With Newton I am content to 'seem to have been only like a boy playing on the sea-shore, and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, whilst the great ocean of truth lay undiscovered before me.' With Napoleon—not a man of science but a man of the world, a man of action—I would say to our neo-Epicureans as he did to his skeptical officers, pointing to the stars, 'Gentlemen, you may talk all night, but who made all these?'"—*Prof. George S. Boulger*, Professor of Botany and Geology, City of London College, since 1884.

"I am not one of those curious beings like Mill, who thought he could make a universe much better than the one we live in, for I know that I am so absurdly ignorant and short-sighted. . . . Self-sufficient fools, I call those who impose their judgments of what *ought* to be on Nature instead of trying to learn and understand what is, and to learn wisdom from it."—*Prof. G. F. Fitzgerald.*

"The 'Religion of the Bible,' rightly understood is the complement—the fulfilment of the facts—of 'recent scientific research.' Much explanation, no doubt, is needed to make this clear; but it is a statement that carries with it proofs acceptable to the largest number of the most thoughtful men of the world."—*Dr. W. H. Dallinger, F.R.S.*

Archaeology's Contribution Towards the Grave of Higher Criticism.

By Rev. J. S. Ross, M.A., D.D.

Paper No. II.

1880. Has Hezekiah's Tunnel Been Found?

In 2 Chronicles xxxii. 30 we read, "This same Hezekiah also stopped the upper watercourse of Gihon and brought it straight down to the west side of the City of David"; and in

2 Kings xx. 20: "And the rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and all his might, and how he made a pool, and conduit, and brought water into the city, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah?"

In 1880, some boys who were playing in the so-called Pool of Siloam, Jerusalem, and wading in a channel cut in the rock, saw an inscription thereon. They informed Dr. Schick, a German architect residing in the city, who, after great difficulty was able, in the following year, to decipher the writing, which consists of six lines. It is the story of the making of a tunnel for water. The excavators had begun at opposite ends, and finally came so near as to hear each other's voices. After the laborers had nearly met, the inscription (which is in the purest Biblical Hebrew) reads: "And after that on the day of excavating, the excavators had struck pick against pick, one against the other, the waters flowed from the spring to the pool for a distance of 1200 cubits, and a hundred cubits was the height of the rock over the head of the excavators."

The prevalent opinion is that this is the record in stone of Hezekiah's work referred to in the above verses, and that here we have actually the Hebrew form of letters used in his reign, and in the time of Isaiah. From the similarity of the letters to those on the Moabite Stone (supposed to be about 850 B. C.) it is probable that this inscription cannot be of a much later date.

1881. Discovery of the Tombs of Egyptian Kings.

At Thebes, in 1881, thirty-nine mummies of the kings of Egypt of the 18th and 19th dynasties were discovered—the latter dynasty reigning at the time of the Exodus. In 1898 seven more mummies of kings were found.

While there may be differences of opinion as to the names of those kings, there seems no doubt but that we have the very mummy of the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and also of the Exodus.

1884. Finding Egyptian Cities of Brick Without Straw.

In Ex. i. 11, referring to the Israelites in Egypt, it is said, "And they built for Pharaoh treasure-cities, Pithom and Raamses"; in verse 14 of the same chapter: "And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field."

Again, in Ex. v. 7, 12, it is recorded, "Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick as heretofore: let them go and gather straw for themselves. So the people were scattered abroad throughout all the land of Egypt to gather stubble instead of straw." In verse 16 it reads that the people complained and said, "There is no straw given unto thy servants, and they say to us, Make brick."

In 1884 excavations were made by Naville at Tel el Maskhuta, near Tel el Kebir, prominent a few years ago in the Egyptian war. He found there the treasure-cities referred to above, the walls of which were about 650 feet square, 22 feet thick, and with partitions from 8 to 10 feet thick. He also discovered that while the religious name of the city was Pithom, the secular

name was Succoth. So that when it is said in Ex. xiii. 20, that "they took their journey from Succoth," we learn they departed from the very place where they had been working, and not from Goshen, which had been given them for a reserve.

Neville further found that the bricks of these treasure-cities were sun-baked; some had been made with straw, some stubble, and towards the top without any straw at all, thus proving that Pharaoh's declaration had been carried out when he said, "I will not give you straw."

It had long been said that the statement respecting mortar could not be true, as the Egyptians never used mortar; but these cities were found built with mortar—the only ruins so found in Egypt—thus proving the exactness of the Scripture record.

1887. The Great Find at Tel El Amarna.

In 1887 some wandering Arabians found 320 tablets at Tel el Amarna, on the banks of the Nile, 180 miles south of Cairo. This has proved one of the most valuable discoveries of modern times, to the great discomfiture of many fine higher critical assumptions. Colonel Conder says: "These letters are the most important historical records ever found in connection with the Bible." Of these tablets, 180 are in the Berlin Museum, 80 in the British Museum, and the balance in Egypt and in the hands of private parties. Kyle says: "The widest diffusion of letters is indicated. All sorts of people are found writing letters: governors and court officers, petty officials, private citizens, ladies and servants." Scores of these communications are on war, business, and royal matrimonial affairs, and preceding, as they do, the conquest of Canaan by Joshua, show the wonderful literary culture of that period. They were found in a crumbling wooden box, and relate to a time about 1400 B. C. After being buried in the sand over 3000 years they were found only 27 years ago. They are of clay, which were written on, and afterwards baked. The Arabs broke some of them up so as to sell for more. They relate to a period previous to the victory over the Canaanites by Joshua; perhaps, more correctly to a time midway between Abraham and Moses.

Reference is made to a people harassing the Canaanites called the "Habiri," which lead some to ask, "Can it be possible this word means Hebrews?" Several letters are endorsed with the name of the sender, and the time of their arrival. There are letters from Ebed-Tob, king of Jerusalem, and also from the king of Babylon to the king of Egypt, but mostly they are from Phoenician and Canaanitish princes and governors to the king of Egypt. Some are from other cities of Palestine and Western Asia to Amenophis III and his son Amenophis IV in the 15th century B. C.

It is to be noted that Ebed-Tob, king of Jerusalem, is represented as both a king and priest, the same offices as were held by Melchisedec, king of Salem (Jerusalem) in Abraham's time. These letters also prove the existence of the Hittites, long disputed by the critics.

One peculiarity of the writing is that the language is not Egyptian hieroglyphics, but in cuneiform (wedge-shaped Babylonian) letters, showing that the language of diplomacy, for that day, was not Egyptian but Babylonian, like French in Europe to-day. This language was very difficult to learn, and required long and large culture on the part of the writers and readers, which proves that this age, instead of being barbarous, as has been often asserted, was one highly intelligent. Professor Robertson in his "Early Religion" says: "We need no longer, therefore, wonder that among the towns taken by Joshua (Josh. xv. 15; Judg. i. 11) was one called Kirjath-Sepher, Book-Town, or (Josh. xv. 49) Kirjath-Sannah, City of Instruction, or that a lad (Josh. viii. 14, R. V.) caught at the roadside, was able to write down the names of the chief men of Succoth in the time of the Judges." And yet, George Adam Smith says that Moses, who is declared to have been brought up in all the learning of the Egyptians, did not know how to read or write!

Some of the letters to the Egyptian king

ask for more troops, else all would be lost, as, among others, the "Habiri" they say were troubling them. One wrote so persistently on this subject that the king finally replied that if his correspondent wrote less and fought more he would be better pleased.

1890. Did Sennacherib Besiege Lachish in Hezekiah's Time?

Lachish is one of the cities captured by Joshua, the story of which is related in Joshua x. 32.

In 2 Chron. xxxii. 9 we read: "After this did Sennacherib king of Assyria send his servants to Jerusalem (but he himself laid siege against Lachish, and all his power with him) unto Hezekiah, king of Judah, and unto all Judah that were at Jerusalem." Again, in

2 Kings xviii. 13-15: "Now in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah did Sennacherib king of Assyria come up against all the fenced cities of Judah and took them. And Hezekiah, king of Judah, sent to the king of Assyria to Lachish saying, I have offended; return from me; that which thou puttest on me will I bear. And the king of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah king of Judah three hundred talents of silver, and thirty talents of gold. And Hezekiah gave him all the silver that was found in the house of the Lord, and in the treasures of the king's house."

Here it is definitely stated that the king of Assyria was at Lachish, that Hezekiah sent a messenger to him there, and that he was required to pay Sennacherib a certain amount of money. Did Sennacherib ever visit Lachish? If so, is there any evidence of it outside the Bible?

Now that Sennacherib was at Lachish at the time mentioned is proved by a slab (the picture of which is found in Sayce's "Light From the Ancient Monuments"), found in 1890, representing the capture of Lachish. The drawing shows a king seated, and people in procession bringing him presents. The inscription reads: "Sennacherib, the king of multitudes, the king of Assyria, sat on an upright throne, and the spoil of the city of Lachish passed before him." The bas-relief rests in the British Museum, and proves the minute accuracy of Scripture.

1901. Wellhausen's Mainstay Broken Down. Also Explanation of Greek Words Found in Daniel.

In 1901, with further discoveries in 1904 and 1907, papyrus was found at Elephantiné, 400 miles south of Cairo. The roll was tied with a string, and the seal was unbroken. The documents are carefully dated—the month, and sometimes the day of the month being inscribed. The time is 471 to 411 B. C., which includes the time of Nehemiah, who lived 440 B. C. Tolerable, though not perfect, identifications have been made out of Sanballat and Johanan, mentioned in Nehemiah.

But, most important of all, these papyri show the existence of a Jewish temple, on the banks of the Nile, with sacrifices, etc., in the fifth century before Christ. It is supposed that a colony from Jerusalem in 586 B. C., after the destruction of that city went to Egypt, and taking Jeremiah with them founded a temple in that country. Jedoniah was the name of the priest there in 411. He wrote for help to Johanan, the high priest at Jerusalem, to rebuild their temple, which had been recently destroyed. Permission to do so was given him by the Governor of the Jews.

Wellhausen asserts that the Book of Leviticus must have been composed about 444 B. C. (a thousand years after Moses). Because, about that time, all altars (except of course that at Jerusalem) had been for the first time broken down. He further says: "The returning exiles were thoroughly imbued with the idea of Josiah's reformation, and had no thought of worshipping except in Jerusalem. . . . From this date all Jews understood, as a matter of course, that the one God had only one sanctuary."

But here is documentary proof of a temple existing on the Nile, with full ceremonies, *after* Nehemiah's return to Jerusalem, which fact alone breaks down the mainstay of the Wellhausen theory.

Again, these papyri show that the latest

recorded events in the Old Testament could not have occurred later than 400 B. C. But some of the books of the Old Testament, especially the Pentateuch, must have been written centuries earlier, because in Neh. viii. 1-14 is an account of the reading of the law of Moses to the people, and further, the book was so old that the feast of tabernacles had been quite forgotten. Thus is destroyed the higher critical argument for the late writing of the book of the Pentateuch.

These same documents also compel the critics to revise their date for the writing of the book of Daniel, which they said must have been written (not about 570 B. C.), but during the time of the Maccabees, say 320 B. C. The reason assigned is the existence of Aramean and Persian words; also the names of Greek instruments at the time of the setting up of Nebuchadnezzar's idol. The critics have declared that there was no Greek influence in Asia at that time. But Petrie has unearthed three Egyptian cities which he says were inhabited by 30,000 Greeks about 665 B. C., that is, 95 years before the book of Daniel was written—certainly a sufficient length of time for Greek influence, and the name of Greek musical instruments to travel from Egypt to Babylon. Consequently the late date given by critics to the book of Danel must, by themselves, be opened again.

Grimsby, Canada.

"I think that there is nothing in the latest discoveries of Science which is opposed to the teaching of Christ. And I believe that is the opinion of a large number of eminent persons of scientific repute in this country. There is an association called the Guild of St. Luke, which consists of members of my profession. It comprises among the members a number of men of the first rank as surgeons and physicians. It not only privately professes the Christian religion, but it publicly does so by holding a solemn service once a year at St. Paul's Cathedral, and this service is largely attended."—*Dr. Henry Trentham Butlin, D.C.L.,* President of the Royal College of Surgeons of England.

"It is the glory of Science that it does progress; that is to say, it is the glory of Science that it changes, that it is continually undergoing reconstruction, that it continually requires restatement. . . . Science deals with fact, which is temporal; Religion deals with truth, which is eternal. . . . For Science deals with things that change and of their changes, and it is the changing thought of man concerning these. But religion deals with that which is eternal and reaches all, even the poor, the ignorant and the young. . . . The little child can apprehend, as well as the wisest sage, the first article of religion, 'I believe in God the Father, who made me and all the world.' That truth, whether so expressed, or expressed in the first words of Genesis, 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,' is the foundation of all science, as well as all religion."—*Edward Walter Maunder, F.R.S.S.*

"There can never be anything but a passing antagonism between true religion and true science, because both are occupied with the search after Truth. The one deals mainly with the truth regarding this life and this world, the other mainly with that which is to come. The facts of this world in the experience of one generation or many generations, may be opposed to the teaching of the Christian religion, as in the doctrine of the Incarnation and the miracles associated with it, but this in no way proves the falsity of the teaching. The experience of a man (or an ant) is as nothing in the history of the Universe. What can we 'hold by' as Christians? We can hold by the Faith of the early Apostles as enunciated in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, and plainly foreshadowed in 1 Cor. xv. This was written within thirty years of our Lord's crucifixion and must have been 'received' by St. Paul immediately on his conversion."—*Prof. John W. Taylor, M.Sc.,* President of the British Gynæcological Society, 1904.

The Continent-wide Campaign can begin at once if each Subscriber will get another. DO IT NOW!

The Supremacy of the Bible.

Rev. Binney Simpson Black, B.A., Montreal, Can.

The most amazing, and in every way the greatest, book produced in human history is the Bible. It has captivated the imagination of the world and influenced the history of the race more than any other book and, indeed, more than all other books put together. It stands in a class by itself. Famous books go out of fashion; they have their day and cease to be. But this Book of books is the contemporary of all the ages, because the seed of an immortal life is in it. The shores of time are strewn with the wreckage of a hundred perished literatures, but here is a book that baffles adverse winds and waves and floats like Noah's ark secure on the sea of time. Generations rise up to own its worth, to live by it, and then, when dying, to pillow the head upon its precious promises.

The Bible is the greatest book in the world in point of literary merit. The men of clearest brain and purest life recognize the Bible's supreme place in literature, its intellectual superiority over all other books. This Book, like the sheaf in Joseph's dream, stands upright, and the mightiest intellects of earth bow down to do it homage. We find in it poetry, philosophy, history, biography, laws, letters, and that man must have studied the Scriptures but slightly who has not found in them many sources of astonishment, and many subjects for grateful meditation. The awful sublimity of some parts of inspired writing, the deep and impassioned tenderness of others, the noon-day light which the simplicity of patriarchal and gospel narrative sheds on every scene, the diversity of character portrayed, the comprehensive nature of revelation,—these are only a few features of interest belonging to a land of wonder. Any one who aspires to a knowledge of the best in the world's literature must drink deep at this fountain head. It is an encouraging fact that more and more the Bible is being appreciated as a book of incomparable literary value.

But the Bible is more than a treasure house of literature. It is a revelation of God and from God. It begins by bringing man face to face with his Maker, and exalts the being of God from Genesis to Revelation. It is the word of the God who manifests Himself in human experience and reveals Himself in human speech. Nature and history reveal God, but only partially. The highest disclosure of God comes to us through the sacred oracles. The Bible as we have it has revealed to men the grace and glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. The best proof that it came from God is that it leads to God those who diligently read in its God-breathed pages and conform their lives to its teaching. This the Bible will do to the end of time, for the revelation of the Old and New Testament does not relate either to facts which are transient in their influence or to principles which can be subverted. The existence of a God and of the necessary relations between the Creator and the created, is the basis of all the requirements which the Scriptures make on our attention and obedience. Because this Book is the unique revelation of God's mind and will, it has a quality no other book possesses. To the man who denies the divine origin of the Bible, our best plan is not to argue for its divinity, but just produce the book itself, show what it is, what it teaches, what it has done and is doing in the world to-day. "Give her the fruit of her hands, and let her own works praise her in the gates!"

Another glory of the Bible is that it is a regenerative force in human life. This must follow from its being a revelation. It is a simple fact that it has a more vigorous hold upon the faith and affections of men to-day than it ever had before. It makes for individual redemption and social righteousness, and its empire widens with the centuries. Its influence on national life is seen by a study of the map of the world. Where the Christian nations are, there look for the Bible, and see how the light that emanates from them is finding its way to those who sit in darkness. To the man who asks, "What is the world's debt to the

Christian's Bible?" we may answer, The Ten Commandments, which form the basis of our Statute Law, and the Sermon on the Mount, that code of morals Christ proclaimed, superior to any morality the world has ever known,—these come from the Bible, and back of them is the Divine character of Him who is both Son of God and Saviour of mankind, the growing Figure of the centuries. It is the Bible with its everlasting gospel of the blessed God which in all ages has been the source of man's regeneration, and in continued beneficence shall flow on in a still wider and more enriching stream to all generations and ages to come.

The supreme message of the Bible is to the moral and spiritual nature of man. It inspires in human souls a passion for righteousness and creates a longing for true holiness. It makes men "wise unto salvation." It displays the only true and permanent measure of rectitude by which the character of the Almighty is to be ascertained and that of His creatures finally determined, and it is also a record in which the knowledge of sin is afforded only to prepare the mind for an offer of forgiveness. The purpose of redemption was the object of patriarchal faith, the rich burden of prophecy, and the theme of whose accomplished glory the New Testament is a witness. The Bible is not engaged only in the ministry of condemnation. Although the inspired apostle has portrayed all flesh as the decaying production of "corruptible seed," and its beauty more fleeting than the flower's bloom, yet it tells of a great salvation not in word only but in power, and makes possible for every man the fulfilment of his proper destiny as a child of God and an heir of Eternity. This is the supreme message of the Bible and its crowning glory to reveal.

All this the Bible does, and what it does is independent of all questions of inspiration. We should be thankful for all those whose piety and reverent scholarship are devoted to solving the great questions of religion on their philosophical and historical side. For there are mysteries connected with religion, and with the great vehicle of revelation, the Bible. But there are certainties too, certainties that find their attestation in man's very soul. And it is too often forgotten that what the Bible offers pre-eminently is not a philosophy or an argument, but a message, and this message lies apart from any theory of inspiration. The Bible speaks! It speaks to the devout soul with a voice whose authority exceeds that of any earthly sovereign or state. He may not be able to define inspiration in a way satisfactory to others, or even to himself, but he responds to it. You do not need to demonstrate the beauty of the rainbow to the unclouded eye, or the obligations of virtue to a heavenly mind. The witness is within. I believe in the divine inspiration of the Bible because it divinely inspires me. I believe in the miracles of the Book because in me there has been wrought the miracle of miracles, a new creation. I believe in the Bible because multitudes now in glory and multitudes on their way have believed and not been put to shame. Speaking one day to a dear old saint whose sun was near its setting, I asked him the secret of his radiant faith in Christ and in the Bible. And the answer was convincing. He said: "At rest in the shadow of the quiet little country church till the day break and the shadows flee away, is the precious dust of one who, before she departed, asked me to read to her the 14th chapter of the Gospel according to John. And so I read: 'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you." In that unshaken faith my mother died—it is now many years ago—and in that faith my wife, a mother too, laid down her life. The Bible was their comfort and inspiration, their help and hope when these things were the only things worth while."

Another glory of the Bible is its universal character. It is for all—the father and the mother and the little children, the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the multitudes that swarm over the earth in all the variety of dusty toil, and the learned that sit apart and intermeddle with all wisdom. To the hoary head this book gives the only cheer and comfort that can be given, and to the youth it gives guidance

and nourishment as it did to Timothy. It is for all. The author stoops to communicate both in the most familiar and winning way. "He remembereth that we are dust," and He speaks by the oracle of his Spirit "after the manner of men." As a father, when surrounded by the domestic group, drops instruction by morsels and pours out his wisdom in a child's expression that it may meet a child's comprehension, so our Father who is in heaven gives us "here a little and there a little" of His truth as we are able to bear it, and suits his language to the diminutive experience and feeble intellect of the human family. So it is we find the most important spiritual realities inviting our attention on the sacred page under the forms of earthly things. Every pleasant object of His world is made the representative of one which belonged to a better, and His apples of gold which have dropped from the tree of life are found in the silver baskets of type, parable, and beautiful story, that we may be won to search for the sense of Scripture through the attraction of its style.

Another glory of the Bible is its future. The holy themes by which we have been made wise unto salvation remain in the earth to bless and make it "fruitful in righteousness" when we are dead and gone. The few droppings which now refresh the weary heritage of heaven shall then pour down showers of blessing. "The word of the Lord endureth for ever." The world has not yet produced the harvest which the Lord desired in the travail of his soul. But there is no ignoring the fact that what Moses wrote thirty-five centuries ago, that what David and the prophets wrote in the early B. C. calendar, that what Jesus spoke and Paul wrote twenty centuries ago, is more potent now than ever in the lives of millions of the best people on earth. The Bible is not an old almanack we no longer consult; it is the last edition of good news that is packed with the best God has for man in time and in eternity. That glorious torch, the Sun, and the soft silver lamp of night shall utterly fail, and the foundations of the solid earth be shaken, before the Book of books shall lose its place and power with the children of men.

"What more cogent evidence of Christianity can you have than its existence? It stands to-day as the religion which, in most civilized countries, represents that which has been found by the operation of natural laws to be best suited for the present circumstances of mankind. You are a Christian because you cannot help it. Turn Mohammedan to-morrow — will you stop the spread of Christianity? Your individual renunciation of Christianity will be but a ripple on the wave. Civilized mankind holds to Christianity, and cannot but do so till it can find something better. This, it seems to me, is a stronger evidence of Christianity than any of the loose-jointed arguments I find in evidential literature."— *Sir Edward Brabrook*, President of the Anthropological Institute, Great Britain.

"I must congratulate you on the last number of THE BIBLE CHAMPION, as it certainly contains a great deal of helpful matter, and I trust will have a widening circulation."

It is not saying too much to declare that the Methodist Episcopal Church has come to the dividing of the ways:

"What concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" (2 Cor. vi. 15).

The hour has struck for some prophet of God to repeat to the people of God, the challenge of Elijah:

"How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord, be God, follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him" (1 Kings xviii. 21).

"All the contents of THE CHAMPION thus far are excellent, but Professor Townsend's and Judge Lamb's articles are master-pieces, or to quote the remark of a friend, they are 'simply unanswerable.'"

The Continent-wide Campaign can begin at once if each Subscriber will get another. DO IT NOW!

THE CLUB.

Jesus and Inerrancy.*

Rev. David James Burrell, LL.D.

"The Jews, at the time of the advent, no more believed in the absolute correctness of current versions than we do nowadays; but they did believe unwaveringly in the perfect truth of the Scriptures in their original form.[1] And had not Jesus shared in that opinion he would surely, as an honest teacher, have made some protest against or dissent from it.[2]

"The attitude of Jesus was not that of a Biblical Critic, for obvious reasons: 1. He showed his general accord with the ultimate purpose of the textual or 'lower criticism,' in the emphasis he placed upon the authority of the Scriptures in their original form. Not once or twice but again and again he protested against the giving of co-ordinate authority to the 'tradition of the elders.' This could only be because he believed that the Scriptures, as thus originally given, were an absolutely faithful and correct presentation of the truth which God desired to reveal to men.

"And just here we note a singular differentiation between the Bible and all other literature. The 'latest edition' of other books is the best. The text books used in our schools of learning must be revised from time to time in order to keep them abreast of the age. But the best edition of the Bible is its first one. The effort on all sides is not to revise it but to restore it to its original form. This can only mean that the Bible in that original was divinely adjusted to the progress of the ages. All its scientific propositions,[3] its prophecies,[4] its laws and jurisprudence,[5] its theological statements,[6] and its plan of salvation,[7] were recorded with a definite view to the vicissitudes of time. And the fact that none of them has been reversed or even amended in the progress of the centuries can only be explained by reference to their divine origin."

* *The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Scriptures.*

APPENDICES.

1. "One thing at any rate was quite certain. The Old Testament, leastwise, the law of Moses, was directly and wholly from God; and if so, then its form also—its letter—must be authentic and authoritative. Thus much on the surface, and for all. . . . Christ was in sympathy with all the highest tendencies of his people and time. Above all, there was his intimate converse with the Scriptures of the Old Testament. If in the synagogue, he saw much to show the hollowness, self-seeking, pride, and literalism which a more external observance of the law fostered, he would ever turn from what man or devils said to what he read, to what was 'written.' Not one jot or hook of it could fall to the ground—all must be established and fulfilled. The law of Moses in all its bearings, the utterances of the prophets—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Micah, Zechariah, Malachi—and the hopes and consolations of the Psalms, were all to him literally true, and cast their light upon the building which Moses had reared. It was all one; a grand unity; not an aggregation of different parts, but the unfolding of a living organism. Chiefest of all, it was the thought of the Messianic bearing of all Scripture in its unity, the idea of the kingdom of God and the King of Zion, which was the light and life of all."—Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*

2. "We pause just here to note a singular parallel between Christ and the Scriptures: 1. They are both alike called The Word of God. 2. They are both theanthropic; that is, the Divine and human are inextricably blended in their fabric; yet not so as to prevent their absolute truth and faultlessness. 3. Both originals have vanished from sight; and are transmitted through succeeding ages only through the lives and labors of fallible men. Nevertheless, we believe in the unseen Christ, and thus believing 'rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.' And for a like reason we believe in the Original Autograph of the Scriptures as it left the pens of those holy men who wrote as they were moved by the Spirit of God. 4. Despite all errors in the transmission of the two Words, written and incarnate, they are alike in such substantial perfection as to be profitable unto every good work,' and wholly effective in guiding and saving men."

3. "The order of creation, as thus stated in Genesis, is faultless in the light of modern science."—*Sir J. W. Dawson.*

4. "Macaulay once ventured into the realms of prediction, when he intimated that perhaps, in the remote future, some traveler from New Zealand might, in the mist of a vast solitude, 'take his stand on a broken arch of the London bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.' His words represent the very summit of improbability; yet there are a thousand prophecies in Scripture equally improbable, uttered at times when the world-powers were in their glory; and not one of them has gone by default. Tyre, Sidon, Egypt, Babylon, Assyria; they have turned out precisely as the ancient prophets said they would do. The graves of nations line the path of history; and from their solitary ruins the owl and bittern, the fox and jackal bear testimony to the exact truth of the Word of God."

5. "It is sometimes affirmed, as an objection to the Scripture, that there are portions which cannot be read aloud. It is true; but this is an argument in their favor; since they were not written to be read aloud but to regulate all human life. There are things occurring in every civil court which cannot be proclaimed on the housetops. There are surgical operations in every hospital, necessary and helpful, which it would not be well to perform before the public eyes. The Bible is intended to be a perfect system of moral pathology and therapeutics. It anticipates all public crimes and private vices, and deals heroically with them."

6. "All the discoveries of philosophy have not produced a single additional truth; they have merely thrown new light upon the teachings of the Book. Every doctrine which has been advanced, from time to time, in opposition to this teaching, has been pronounced a heresy and inevitably demonstrated to be false by the stern logic of events. No New Theology has thus far been able to vindicate itself; its only hope of vindication, in the clear light of history, being in its final adjustment to the doctrinal system of the Scriptures."

7. "There are other sacred books and other religions which offer us religious doctrines and ethical codes; but there is none that answers this question: 'What shall a man do to be delivered from the record of a sinful past?'"

Anthropomorphism in the Bible.

Prof. L. T. Townsend, LL.D.

This word means the conception or representation of Deity under human form, or with human attributes or affections. The trouble with many people is a tendency to accord a too literal sense to all such representations.

The critic of the Bible alleges, and it is a gray headed declaration, that the Bible teaches that God has eyes, hands and feet like those of a man.

The critic sometimes goes so far as to say that the God of the Bible is simply an overgrown Jew, with full beard on his face, "who lives in the next room," and who is subject to all the grosser passions of the most brutal men.

Now, while this last statement as to the overgrown Jew is a vicious misrepresentation, yet that God is repeatedly spoken of in the Old Testament as having eyes, arms, hands and feet, there can be no question. And so the critic at first thought, appears to have made his point.

The usual reply of orthodoxy is, that these words, eyes, hands, feet, fingers, breath, and voice of God, are employed on account of the imperfections, or rather limitations of human speech; that all things considered, even infinite wisdom could not improve on these representations, and that it would have been pedantic, if not ridiculous, had Bible writers employed language suited only for a scientific treatise or lecture room.

It should be borne in mind, however, that the Bible was not written for scientists and philosophers alone but also for the toiling and suffering millions of the human race, of every land and of all times, for people who have neither the leisure nor opportunity for mastering the nomenclature of the university, and in case of such people, orthodoxy has the best of reasons for saying that the language of the Bible cannot well be improved. And more than this, these very terms and representations objected to by our skeptical hyper-critics are employed by intelligent and scholarly people the world over.

Coleridge, speaking of Milton's writings, says: "Although Milton was undoubtedly a high Arian in his mature life, he does in

the necessity of poetry give a greater objectivity to the Father and the Son than he would have justified in argument; yet he was wise in adopting the strong anthropomorphism of the Hebrew Scriptures at once."

Professor Tyndall constantly urged upon his scientific co-workers the importance of "visualizing the invisible" (to employ his own words), for "in this way only can we conceive of the invisible existing and acting upon the visible."

Professor Tyndall means that when speaking of the invisible God, of the invisible world, or of invisible things of any kind, even the scientist, if he would best serve his fellow-men, must employ terms and words descriptive of visible objects and words in common use.

And in his *Hours of Exercise in the Higher Alps,* the professor speaks of "mountains hacked and hurt by time."

If these expressions and others like them, such as "the sighing and moaning of the wind," "the laughter of the hillside brook," and the cruelty of nature represented by the phrase, "red in tooth and claw," were excluded from the world's literature it would be nothing short of an inestimable loss.

Renan, the brilliant French writer, speaks of "the fatherly smile that shines across the face of nature." And Kipling sings:

> "Jehovah of the thunders,
> Lord, God of battles, aid."

Robert Ingersoll, who was accustomed to pile his invectives and sarcasms many deep upon the language of the Bible, employed the phrase—"Arrows shot from the quiver of the sun."

Now, will the critic demand that one shall foist into the language of these men absolute literalism? Is it to be supposed that Renan believed that God has a veritable physical face that frowns and smiles; that Kipling believed that God is a real physical warrior at the head of a fighting army; that Ingersoll, when using the words, "arrows shot from the quiver of the sun," intended to have his readers think that the sun is a mighty hunter rushing through the universe and shooting at the stars of heaven with his bow and arrow?

And when David sang his triumphal Psalm: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up, ye everlasing doors; and the King of glory shall come in," is one to suppose he intended to teach his readers that the gates of the city had heads like those of mankind, or that the Lord of Hosts, the King of Glory, having a human form, arrayed in royal robes, with a crown on his head, and sceptre in his hand, was to enter the gates of Jerusalem?

These figures of rhetoric found in the Bible easily can be multiplied. "The floods clap their hands"; "All the trees of the field shall clap their hands"; "Land that floweth with milk and honey." Ears are attributed to heaven, to earth and to destruction; hands to the deep; eyes to the mountains.

"The eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth; His lips are full of indignation and his tongue is a devouring fire; Thou, O Lord shalt laugh at them; thou shalt have all the heathen in derision; The Lord hath opened his armory and hath brought forth the weapons of his indignation."

Is one to suppose that Bible writers believed and intended to teach that the Lord has eyes like those of a man; and that these eyes with legs, are on a run through the earth; or that his tongue is a literal flame of fire; or that he is laughing at the confusion of the heathen, as one man laughs at another who trips and falls on the street? Or did those Bible writers for one moment have the conception that the God they worshipped is "a big Jew, living in the next room"? The supposition is scarcely less than idiotic.

On the other hand, those Bible writers believed and taught that God is infinite in power and majesty; that he is invisible, and that his dwelling is immensity. When, therefore, the terms eye, arm, hand, finger and foot were used by the Bible writers, it was in the same sense they are now used by scientists and poets, and for the same reason, because human language has no better terms with which to express the ideas they wished to convey. And when one has faith in the infinite, personal and ever-present, invisible God, not only is one not disturbed in one's belief in inspiration by the words, eye, arm, hand or fingers of

God, but is helped and encouraged. These familiar expressions bring God nearer to the heart of humanity and make him more real. Those Bible writers "visualized the invisible," the only thing, as Professor Tyndall would say, that can be done to make invisible things intelligible and real, and devout souls in the twentieth century, whether teaching in the university, or working in a coal pit, offer thanks, that God's *eye* is watching over them; that his *hand* is leading and his *arm* is upholding them.

Haeckel's Gorilla Grandfather.

EVOLUTION IN PATCHOGUE.

It Comes to the Notice of an Old Primate of Jena.

To the Editor of the Sun—Sir: Some months ago an address on evolution was delivered in this village by a man well able to discuss the subject, but the audience was altogether too orthodox to receive such solid intellectual food.

After the address I joined a number of men discussing the subject. One said:

"I don't believe such nonsense, that we descended from monkeys. Why, I lived in New York nearly fifteen years, when I was a young man, and I used to go to Central Park most every Sunday and see those monkeys, and all the years I was down there I could not see that those monkeys grew to look like men; they always looked just the same."

I considered the story so good I thought the greatest living anthropologist would appreciate it, so I wrote it out and sent it to Professor Ernst Haeckel of Jena. It must have pleased the old scientist for he wrote me and sent his photograph, underneath which he wrote:

Ernst Haeckel.
An old Primate of 80 years
descended from Pithecanthropus.

The monkey Professor Haeckel says he descended from lived in Java before the glacial period, could stand erect and walk; was known as "The Ape-Man of Java." We should not inspect the monkeys so close at hand.

Arington H. Carman.

Patchogue, L. I., N. Y.

"*Pithecanthropus erectus* is the name given to the species supposed to be represented in discoveries made by Dr. Dubois in Central Java in 1894. The specimens consist of two teeth found at different times, a few yards from each other, the top part of a skull found about a yard from one of the teeth, and a femur (thigh-bone) found about fifteen yards distant. These were all obtained at different times in volcanic tufa (deposit) on the bank of the river Bengawan, near Trinil. Little can be inferred, however, concerning the age of the remains from the hardness of the rock in which they occurred, for volcanic outflows of various sorts have occurred at all geological ages, even down to the present. But the deposits were inferred to be Tertiary from the associated vertebrae fauna, which were classified as late Tertiary. This, however, is subject to the doubt already referred to in speaking of the mammalian remains in the auriferous gravels of California, as to whether there is a hard and fast line to be drawn between the Tertiary and Post-Tertiary fossils, and whether the same species became extinct at the same time in all parts of the world.

"The cranium of the *Pithoecanthropus Erectus* is indeed remarkable for its small brain capacity. But even so it is separated a great ways from that of the highest apes, and is not inferior to that of some existing races of men. According to Cope, it had a brain capacity of 61 cubic inches, as against 91.5 cubic inches, normal human, and about 30.5 cubic inches for the gorilla. But Virchow gives 57.95 cubic inches as the cranial capacity of some Negritos and only 48.46 cubic inches for an inhabitant of New Britain. The tooth might do for a gorilla, but the thigh bone is long and straight, entirely human. From the shape of the thigh bone it is evident that the individual to which it belonged walked erect, which implies that the remarkable adjustment of the cervical vertebrae between the spinal column and the head, which, more than any other anatomical peculiarity, differentiates man from the ape. Hence comparative anatomists like Cope and Lyddeker have no hesitation in pronouncing the specimens entirely human. They are those of a man and not of a connecting link."—*The Origin and Antiquity of Man*, G. Frederick Wright, LL.D., F.G.S.A.

One of the most pathetic incidents in human history is the bitter weeping and wailing of Mark Twain at the grave of Adam. Almost equal to it, however, is the pride and joy of Ernst Haeckel as he wrote: "An old Primate of 80 years descended from Pithecanthropus." To go into raptures over a couple of teeth, a thigh bone and a piece of skull of an Ape Man, who walked erect and was the missing link between Apes and Men, stirs our emotions to their uttermost depths. But when the bones turn out to belong to some low-down human, who is no missing link at all, then we have a right to expect pathos spelled with a *b*. Farewell, *Pithecanthropus Erectus,* peace to thy bones!—Editor.

The Anniversary of Pentecost

Rev. L. I. McDougle.

The Dispensation of the Father extended over 4,000 years and that of the Son over three years. Of this period the Patriarchal Dispensation covered 2,500 years and the Mosaic 1,500 years. The Feast of the Passover marked the beginning of the Hebrew period, celebrated annually in commemoration of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage in 1491 B. C., and pointed on to the atoning sacrifice of the "Lamb of God."

The Jewish Decalogue, effective during their dispensation, was given after the second forty days absence of Moses. The Patriarchal Decalogue, effective during the Patriarchal and Christian dispensations, was given on the fiftieth day after the Passover and the deliverance of the children of Israel; given on the Sabbath day instituted by the Lord and observed by Adam and Eve and that age; given on the Patriarchal Sabbath and the day after the seventh Jewish Sabbath, instituting the Feast of Pentecost, pointing to the Advent of the Holy Ghost and the inauguration of the last dispensation.

Three times a year all the males were required to appear before the Lord, in the Feast of the Passover Abib 15th, the Feast of Weeks or Pentecost Sivan 5th, and the Feast of Tabernacles beginning on the 15th day of the seventh month. They observed the Day of Atonement and the Sabbatic year. The forty-ninth and fiftieth years were known as the Year of Liberty or Jubilee and was also called The Acceptable Year of the Lord. All of these were observed by the Hebrews for 1,500 years.

In the year A. D. 33, The Acceptable Year of the Lord, Jesus was crucified on the 14th day of the month Abib, the day of preparing the sacrifices, lay in the tomb on the 15th, and arose therefrom on the 16th, the old Patriarchal Sabbath and the day on which they waived the sheaf of the first fruits. The fortieth day He ascended to heaven, giving the apostles his parting blessing and the promise of the Holy Ghost.

They returned to Jerusalem, not for prayer, preparation or consecration, but rather to await the fullness of time and the Advent of the Holy Spirit on the Day long observed. The Holy Spirit could not come a day before or after Pentecost any more than Jesus could have been offered before or after the Passover. They were types of great events to come. The Day of Pentecost, the fiftieth day after the Passover of the Acceptable Year of the Lord, marked the converging of all days, years, feasts, rites and events, the closing of all dispensations and the inauguration of the Christian Dispensation, and known also as the Dispensation of the Holy Ghost which shall never pass away.

Pentecost was instituted first on the fiftieth day after the exodus of Israel. This was observed regularly every year. The Anniversary of Pentecost was observed by the early Christian Church. Acts xx., 16; xxi., 20, 21; and 1 Cor. xvi., 8. In the middle of the fourth century the church was rent in twain, and it is very evident from all that followed that this event was no longer observed. Later the Western church claimed to be the guide of believers. Spiritual darkness spread over the general church and increased for many centuries.

Martin Luther, in the 15th century, turned the tide toward spiritual light and liberty by contending that the Holy Bible was the guide of Believers. John Wesley never denied the rightful place of the church nor the authority and illuminating power of the living Word. But he proclaimed that the Holy Ghost was the guide of true believers, the interpreter of the Word, the illuminator of the mind, the purifier of the heart, thus turning the church back to the apostolic days.

I do not object to the observance of Christmas, Easter, church and national days. By recognizing and emphasizing this dispensational event will revitalize the spiritual life of the church. There is no Christian festival, event, anniversary year or day more appropriate, or that will result in greater spiritual good to the church, than the observance of the Advent of the Holy Ghost. Begin on ascension day if convenient. Love Feast, May 31st, at 9.00 A. M., the hour the apostles met; Sermon at 10.30.

Smyrna, Del.

DUTY OF TRUSTEES TO THE DEAD.

That trustees have a duty to the dead which they cannot set aside if they accept the trust, is being more and more acknowledged by the public. If the property ot a dead man, left for specific purposes, is disposed of, or used contrary to the intention of the founder, the men responsible for this diversion of the gift are guilty of a grave breach of morals, to say the least—or the most. This subject has come up just now in the case of the Liverpool Athenæum, which sold the Burns Glenriddel manuscripts to an American. The right of the Athanæum to sell the manuscripts will be contested in the court, and the London firm which secured them for the buyer has been asked to hold them pending the court decision. James C. Ewing, curator of the Baillie Library, of Glasgow, spoke before Burns Clubs and other Scottish societies meeting in Glasgow, to protest the sale. He condemned the sale, and declared that the Liverpool Athenæum, profiting from its experience when a proposal to sell the same manuscripts to the late J. P. Morgan, was killed by the local press, had negotiated the present sale in secrecy. There could not be any doubt that Mrs. Currie had intended the gift of the manuscripts not only as a memorial to Burns, but as a memorial to her father-in-law, Dr. Currie. In accepting the manuscripts, Mr. Ewing contended, the Athenæum covenanted to keep them permanently, and not to regard them as its own private property. An unpublished letter from Mr. Thomson, a friend of Burns, to Professor Wilson, dated 1808, was read at the meeting. It pointed to the fact that Mrs. Burns was afraid of offending Dr. Currie by asking the return of the manuscripts. The meeting finally passed a resolution, declaring the manuscripts were not the property of the Athenæum to sell, that the sale was an outrage to the responsibilities and reliance placed on public trustees, and an insult to the Scotch and the innumerable admirers and students of Burns.

"The longer I live the more evidence meets me of the complete harmony between the Bible and Science. Archæological evidence especially has multiplied, and is multiplying, in our own days, and is uniformly and invariably in illustration of the truths of Holy Writ. Not only is the Bible in harmony with the ascertained conclusions of Science, but it contains remarkable anticipations of scientific truths which were not known to scientists until long afterwards. Take, for instance, the scientific discoveries in Job xxvi. 7. *"He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing."* It is my settled conviction that between the established facts of Science and the fundamental teachings of Christianity there is no real antagonism. If any man of science dissents from this view, he is, in my judgment, chargeable either with ignorance, or making his wish the father of his thought."—*Prof. H. Langhorne Orchard, M.A., B.Sc.*

The Continent-wide Campaign can begin at once if each Subscriber will get another. DO IT NOW!

CURRENT COMMENT.

RETURNING TO THE BIBLE.

In the history of the Church there have been two chief subjects of discussion: The Revelation and the Interpretation of the Revelation. The first of these asks: Is the Bible a revelation from God, trustworthy, infallible and final, as to what we are to believe and do? The second asks: What does this Bible teach?

The question of the Revelation has been occupying the attention of Christendom alomst exclusively for more than three decades. The people have well nigh forgotten to study the Bible and, have given themselves up to talking about it. As a result, there is a woeful ignorance of the Bible and its contents. The destructive critics have been defiant and boastful, and have again and again threatened to demolish the Book. Ridicule, speculation and attack of all kinds were directed against the Bible, to destroy its authority and its integrity. The people stood aghast, trembling and fearful lest the one rock of their faith and hope was about to be shattered, and they would be turned back to the desert of paganism.

But the critics have broken up into opposing camps. The ammunition has been exhausted, their guns spiked, and the old Bible still stands victorious and defiant. Criticism has passed away, save here and there, like the last rose of summer, blooming only when the conditions are exceptionally favorable; in the academic circle and the mouldy corner of some university, like a violet in October, it tells only of what had been. But the people care nothing about it. The critics expected a great revolution in the people, but the people found there was nothing in destructive criticism. It failed in its purpose and promise, and there is a return to the Bible, and we are entering upon a period of interpretation.—*Presbyterian.*

A GRAVE RESPONSIBILITY.

A minister who dares to broadcast among a largely unstudious laity the seeds of uncertainty with regard to the Bible and the fundamentals taught by it as it is interpreted by evangelical Protestantism, assumes a very grave responsibility. It is easy to unsettle the simple faith of "the common people." It is impossible, often, to stop them, after they have once broken away from the beliefs of the past. They are often more relentlessly logical than the dialectically trained disturbers of their faith in following the primrose path of spiritual easy-goingness to the baleful end. Your adept juggler can swallow his swords without being injured, but when the uniniatiated try it there is danger of their cutting their throats. And so the modern sophist, in pulpit or seminary, can juggle with the verities, without always taking the matter too seriously in its practical bearing on his own religion. He can, when playing with words eliminate the supernatural from the Apostles' Creed, and yet fervently unite in its public confession; throw doubt upon the deity of Christ, and yet join in his worship; explain away the miracles, and yet—but what's the use in continuing the deadly parellel—he can be as heterdox as the avowed unbeliever and yet cling tenaciously in the most orthodox churches. Your trained man can do this, but the masses who are released from the ties of evangelism by his specious arguments lack his facility in theological acrobatics, and when they imitate his "stunts" they land in the hospital or morgue.—*Christian World.*

INFIDELITY IN DISGUISE.

Blatant infidelity at present is unpopular. Robert G. Ingersoll has no successor. No man who avowedly attacks the Christian religion or the character of Jesus Christ, or even religion by whatever name regarded as a fundamental necessity of the human heart, is at present interesting large numbers of people. The enemies of evangelical faith are, however, as active as ever. The form of attack is more subtle, more specious, more covert, and hence even more dangerous than the old method of open attack.—*Northwestern Christian Advocate.*

A VOICE FROM THE PEW.

What are we coming to when a presbytery of the Presbyterian Church will license a man who does not know whether Christ raised Lazarus from the dead, or that Christ was born of the Virgin. How can such a man answer Christ's question: "What think ye of Christ, whose Son is he?" What kind of a gospel will he preach? When a man is soundly converted, those questions do not bother him, no matter whether he is a Jerry McAuley or the son of a Moderator of the General Assembly. Too many of these men have only head religion: what they need is heart religion. I don't take any stock in the men that are crying down creeds and heresy trials; we don't have enough of them. When I say Christ was born of the Virgin Mary my creed is no bigger than his creed who says he was not. Every man has a creed. The devil does not believe in just such a creed as I believe. I have heard my father say more than fifty years ago that the last great apostasy of the Church would be the claim that they could raise up children that didn't need conversion. It looks as if that apostasy were near.—*The Herald and Presbyter.*

GOD'S MOST AUTHORITATIVE REVELATION.

By the Holy Spirit God is speaking to men and women today. He is calling them both to higher attainments in grace and needy fields of service; but he is not speaking to the world now in the same manner that he did when he made his great revelation of moral and spiritual truth through his only begotten Son and the inspired men whom he gathered about him. We have such a community of the Divine Mind and Will in the Scriptures as can nowhere else be found, and hence to them we must ever come for light and guidance. To contend that an individual may have a secret revelation made to his soul equal in authority with that contained in the Bible, is to lay the predicate for all sorts of superstitions and heresies. This is the claim of Mohammedanism, Mormonism, Christian Science, and all the other modern religious cults. God has given us, "once for all," his precious Word; *let us beware of how we neglect it or depart from it.* There has been no change in its fundamental truths, and there never will be.—*New Orleans Christian Advocate.*

The Continent-wide Campaign can begin at once if each Subscriber will get another. DO IT NOW!

A reporter quotes a minister, alleged to be a conservative, as settling the question of the virgin birth, and, indeed, the whole question of the supernatural, by the statement that the gospels of Matthew and Luke are "purely idyllic." We suppose he would brush aside in the same way the history of the Church, and the ordination service, and his own vow accepting the Confession of Faith. He might, with equal honesty, treat his marriage vows and financial obligations in the same way.—*Herald and Presbyter.*

"I know of no fact of Science which is antagonistic to the Bible rightly understood. Our almanack tells us the sun rises at a particular time—every one knows that this is a scientific error, but it is the only way in which people would understand what is meant (and necessary, for if scientific language had been used it would not have been understood). The Bible is, as far as I know, without scientific error."—*Dr. William Carruthers.*

"While it is vain to separate Christian teaching from historical fact, it is necessary to insist that Christianity is an experimental religion, and here we find its harmony with scientific teaching. 'If any man willeth to do His will, he shall know of the doctrine.' Personal experience of Christ's power to save and help is the supreme test."—*Prof. George Carpenter.*

"Science grows more cautious and restrained, and feels her limits more intimately. She knows that the pretence of solving the 'world riddle' by her means alone is a mere echo of youthful enthusiasm; and only our half-educated public which founded the 'League of the Monists' two years ago, now listen to cant of this kind."—*Prof. Hendrich Weinel.*

EDITOR'S WHAT NOT.

COMPLICITY IN HYPOCRISY.

The Churchman, (London), May, 1914, has a very impressive and striking editorial on ministerial hypocrisy. It is largely a statement of the Bishop of Oxford. "He refers to the advanced critics who reject 'Natural Miracles,' including the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection, and asks: 'Is it consistent with the sincerity which ought to attach to public office, and especially to public office in the Christian Church, that a man should pledge himself to the constant recitation of these creeds, as an officer of the society which so strenuously holds them, if he personally does not believe that these miraculous events occurred, if he believes that our Lord was born as other men, or that His dead body did, in fact, see corruption?" The church has been challenged 'to allow the recitation of the creeds by those who do not believe the miraculous events, and we are as near as possible to official complicity.' The Bishop has no doubt about what the answer to his own question should be. He is ready to give the fullest liberty for tentative proposals and free discussion, but a man after a time must make up his mind; 'and when he has come to the conclusion that he does not believe that we have adequate grounds for asserting that our Lord was in fact born of a virgin, or rose again the third day from the dead, he cannot legitimately, or with due regard to public sincerity, retain his position as an officer in a church which requires of its officers the constant recitation of the creeds." "We agree so fully with the Bishop of Oxford on this point, that we trust something may be done—although we admit the great difficulty—to emphasize that, comprehensive as the Church of England is, it is not sufficiently wide to take in those who deny fundamental articles of the Christian faith. It is not a question of philosophical reasoning, it is a question of fact. Either our Lord was or was not born of a Virgin Mother; either His Body, which was laid in the grave after the Crucifixion, rose again the third day or it remained in the grave. There is no alternative. The teaching of the creeds of the Church of England is perfectly clear, and the Church has to demand that its officers who say the 'I believe' should make their affirmation without any mental reservation or qualification whatever. The Bishop of Oxford wisely concludes"

" 'I cannot entertain a doubt that if this claim on the part of the officers of the Church to affirm officially their belief in the occurrence of certain specific events which, in their plain and unmistakable meaning, are at heart not believed to have occurred—if this claim be allowed, so far from 'commending itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God,' the Church which tolerates this claim will be publicly convicted of insincerity, and will lose all moral weight with the mass of Englishmen. I have no doubt that, with few exceptions, the clergy do certainly and unhesitatingly believe the creeds which they profess. But we shall more and more lose both the reputation and the reality of sincerity unless we repudiate, solemnly and directly, the claim which, as I think, is inconsistent with the veracity required in all public professions.' "

It seems the merest child's play for the Church of God of all creeds and all lands to dally with this question. It has become everywhere *the one question.* It is not a matter of scholarship, but of veracity and honor. The clergyman who in the solemn services of his church, recites the creeds and leads the people in thus declaring their faith, while personally disbelieving them, *is a false prophet.* What is worse, if anything can be worse, he stands out in the Divine Presence and is guilty of the crime as a part of the pretended worship of God. If there can be a ranker or more outrageous sacrilege and blasphemy we cannot conceive of it. The Church or superior official who permits this offense without rebuke or censure is guilty of complicity in the same hypocrisy. Honorable men of the world who count it their first duty to prove themselves men

of truthfulness and honor, scorn the churchman who desecrates God's house and His service by lying and hypocrisy. Little wonder that such a vast multitude of men of the highest possible standing for integrity and character are outside the Church.

SAINT JUDAS.

Modern scholarship has rewritten the Scriptures. It has also re-arranged the Apostolical College. It has displaced Saint Peter with Saint Judas. The ancient Judas had the grace to eliminate himself by the aid of a rope and a limb of a tree; the modern Judas demands the chief seat in the Apostolate and the right to leadership. The ancient Judas confessed his crime and exclaimed, "I have betrayed innocent blood." The modern Judas boasts and defends his treason; he declares Jesus was an impostor and was justly crucified with other malefactors. He was not born of a virgin, but was a child of shame—his mother was not a wife. His words are not original, they were the products of his followers. He did not speak truthfully when he said, "Moses wrote of Me." Moses' writings are forgeries; there never was a Moses. He did not speak truthfully when he said the prophets had spoken of Him; the prophets were frauds, there never was a prophecy. He did not speak truthfully when he pretended to quote Daniel, "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." This is the fiction of an unknown romancer; Daniel never wrote a word of his pretended prophecy. His wonderful acts were the inventions of his followers: he never worked a miracle. His death, like his birth, was that of the common lot of all men; his body was corrupted and became dust. His resurrection was a dream born of the visions of hysterical women. His appearances to his disciples were delusions of their excited imaginations.

The ancient Judas paid back the price of his betrayal. The holy villains who tempted him to commit the crime, took the money, but confessed their sin by saying, "It is not lawful for to put it into the treasury, because it is the price of blood." They bought with it the potter's field in which to bury strangers. From that day to this the horror and dread of every sane human being is burial in the potter's field. The modern Judas has no such squeamishness; he steals a church built by holy saints now in glory, and does not hesitate to use its pulpit to preach doctrines that would have filled the church builders with horror. He steals a periodical and uses its columns to teach errors that the majority of the readers believe to be pernicious and sinful. He steals a school, founded and established by humble Christians who denied themselves almost the necessities of life to build it, believing they were providing for the instruction of their children's children in the truth of God. Not one of the self-deniers but would regard the false doctrines taught in the schools of their self-denial as a wicked perversion.

When the Christian Church is fully awake to the purposes and plans of Saint Judas they will give short shrift to his audacity. The courts of all civilized lands have declared by repeated decisions that his conduct is a criminal diversion of trust funds. What kind of intelligence or conscience can palliate or defend it, save that of Saint Judas?

TO ALL MEN OF HONOR.

Gentlemen:—

This appeal is addressed especially to Clergymen, College Faculties, Lawyers, Editors, and Authors. We solicit your aid in securing Fair Play for God and His Word. A friendless, ignorant, vicious negro, charged with petit larceny, will receive in any court of the land fairer consideration and stricter justice than is shown to Almighty God in the Court of Public Opinion at the hands of the men who claim to be gentlemen of learning and honor. Judge Greenleaf, the recognized authority on Evidence on both sides of the Atlantic, after as careful study and examination as he ever gave to anything, decided that the Books of the Bible according to the Jural Rule of an Ancient Document were depositions of their authors. They needed nothing to prove their truthfulness but their own contents. They could only be disproven by the established processes of all civilized courts in the world. Two contemporary witnesses,

equally as competent and truthful as the Biblical writers, must furnish testimony under oath to facts of their own personal knowledge in contradiction of the biblical statements. Take Jonah, for instance, the butt of the jokesmith; his book is a deposition, declaring facts of his own knowledge and experience. Nothing can be offered in disproof of his statements but depositions of two contemporary witnesses. The facts related in the Gospels as to the life, acts and words of Jesus are contained in depositions of competent contemporary witnesses of the most unimpeachable character. Who can read or hear without a blush of shame the ribald, profane, foolish contentions of men supposed to be gentlemen and scholars, offered in contradiction to the plain story related with all the solemnity and sanctity of sworn testimony. Not one of these contenders or contemners would have the hardihood to offer his personal testimony in court relating to the history of Washington or Columbus. Every schoolboy would laugh at the folly of witnesses giving evidence of their personal knowledge of occurrences that happened centuries before they were born.

We leave all questions relating to the importance of the facts in question out of this discussion here. If the Bible were only an out-of-date almanac whose truthfulness had the sanction and approval of all well-informed lawyers and the decisions of the courts for centuries, it would receive respectful consideration. Its contents might be trivial, of no general importance, of no special helpfulness to anybody or anything. Its statements would receive ridicule or travesty from no honest, honorable or respectable person.

It would be needless to offer a single word in behalf of the supreme importance of the Bible to the world. All men know its influence upon nations, cities, individuals. Nothing is more clearly apparent to all thoughtful men than that the discrediting and overthrow of the authority of the Bible would be a calamity scarcely less appalling than the destruction of the world. If it could not be re-established, the destruction of the world would be inevitable. Sin, vice and crime would hold high revel, until Byron's dream of a world of night without a star or a torch would be fully realized in the moral darkness that would be universal.

We solicit the co-operation of all Christians of all creeds, each in his own sphere and in his own way, to create a public sentiment that will hold sacred the character, name and Word of Almighty God. Church unity; with no other purpose than this, would be the greatest blessing to the race possible to human effort. Let the line be drawn sharply, so no one will mistake it. Make it impossible for any one who is a professed friend, or worshipper of God, to pose as a scholar who seeks to bless the world by destroying its faith in the Revealed Truth of God. Hold up to scorn and contumely the treason that demands all the blessings of Christian civilization and seeks to destroy its source. Regard with abhorrence the Judas who poses as a disciple and betrays his Master for a paltry bribe. Make it impossible to say that the only place in all the world where a man who is guilty of the gross betrayal of a sacred trust can hold his head up among honorable men, *is in the Church of God*. Banish from the Holy Pulpit of all faiths the apostate who violates his ordination vow to which he assented with all the inviolability of an oath.

"BEING DEAD, YET SPEAKETH."

We invite careful attention to the article "The Crime of the Higher Criticism" in this number. The author was one of the most romantic knight-errants of the Christian Church. Obsessed with the conviction that the Church was in imminent and deadly peril, he started out singly to combat the Dragon of Infidel Scholarship. The April CHAMPION contained an article relating to his work and its sudden end caused by his untimely death. "The Knight and the Dragon" briefly told the romantic tale, gave testimonials from eminent men of his marvellous ability and his phenomenal success in arousing the Church to a sense of its danger. In an editorial, "The Apotheosis of a Prophet," we paid our tribute to him and his work. We believe now, as we said in these articles, "If he had been spared to a good old age he would certainly have turned the tide and saved the day."

"The Crime of the Higher Criticism" is an indictment of Counterfeit Criticism that was never answered and never can be. The pseudo-critics have gone from one extreme to another until to record the assumptions asserted to-day to be accepted conclusions of scholarship would read like the ravings of frenzied inmates of Bedlam. We recall this indictment as the beginning of the arraignment of the professed leaders in the attacks upon the Scriptures. It is one of the humors of this controversy that here in this country we are just beginning to occupy the positions assumed by the rationalists whom the knight challenged. His biting satire and invective have added pungency and sting because of their years. A quarter of a century hence, long after Continental infidelity has discarded its weapons for others and remembers them only as belonging to the paper dragons and tom-toms of ancient war, we will cease preaching the same foolishness and return to the foolishness of preaching the gospel of our fathers. This article makes plain that the enemy are not earnest, honest seekers after truth, as they so loftily declare; they are not even honorable antagonists combating fairly for success of the right. They seek to deceive by wearing false colors, and uttering protestations of loyalty and fealty; they use forbidden weapons and delight to overcome youth and childhood, which even the degraded prize-ring scoffs and forbids.

It is in the power of any one to test this by applying to the testimony and declarations and arguments of the critics the laws and methods that are universally accepted by all civilized courts. With Greenleaf as the guide, any intelligent person can convict the critics of unfair methods, illegal practices and false testimony. If value of any material kind were the stake, the court would give short shrift to the whole campaign of assault.

SCIENTIFIC CREDULITY IN AN AGE OF KNOWLEDGE.

"Absolutely Pure," "Without Harmful Adulterants," "No Poisonous Preservatives," or similar catch-phrases are the advertiser's bid for attention. The popular fear of peril in all food products, created by the wide publication of reports of experts relating to food adulteration, vanishes, when assured a label is true. Why not manifest the same anxiety concerning Soul Food? "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he" (Proverbs xxiii., 7). Our thinking is largely, if not wholly, the result of what we hear or read. A book is food to the mind and soul. If evil, it begets evil. This is the reason for censorship of evil literature by the State. False teaching, while not always in itself morally evil, may inspire or lead toward evil. This is the reason for the censorship by the Church of what it terms questionable literature. The life of a denomination is its truth as taught in harmony with the revealed Word of God.

The imprint of an Evangelical publishing house has in the past been accepted as a label assuring the purity of the soul food which it produces. It is only within very recent years that any doubt concerning this has been suggested. Houses, once regarded as almost ultra orthodox and conservative, now publish or handle literature which the fathers would have deemed as dangerous and destructive as bald infidelity. To ascertain the value of the label we propose to examine various books written by Evangelical scholars and ascertain whether or not they are in harmony with the standards of doctrine of the denominations they represent. We have reviewed a book by Professor Jackson, of England, formerly of Canada, and one by Professor Kent, of Yale University. We began in April a review by Rev. L. D. Watson, LL.D., of *Christian Faith in an Age of Science*. We are sure our readers will agree that the title of the book ought to be, *Scientific Credulity in an Age of Knowledge*.

It is not enough to say the author is a professor in a great Evangelical Christian college; nor that he is a minister of prominence in one of the greatest denominations; nor that in his conference for twenty years he has been the chairman of the committee that passes on the candidates for the ministry, especially with reference to doctrine; nor that personally he is a most estimable Christian gentleman and a man of most winsome and genial personality; the one question we are in-

terested in now, is, what does he say in his book?

We have been asked, Why devote so much space to the review of a book published so long ago? The Conference Minutes of the New York East Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in 1913, contained a list of books to be read by young men preparing for the ministry. *Christian Faith in an Age of Science* was in the list. It was there, under the authority of the Board of Examiners, chosen to examine candidates for admission, in "*doctrine* and discipline." This fact committed the Board of Examiners and the Conference to the endorsement of the standard of *doctrine* taught in the book. That the author of the book, who was President of the Board of Examiners, with the knowledge and consent of the Board and the Conference, thus commended to young men preparing for the Christian ministry, *Christian Faith in an Age of Science,* in 1913, makes it *up-to-date in peril and audacity.* Methodism is not quite ready, we are sure, to supplant St. Peter with St. Judas.

APPEAL OF PRESIDENT HALL.

The Bible League has rallied from the misfortunes caused by the long illness and breakdown of the former Secretary and Editor, Dr. Gregory. The movement to organize the friends of the Bible throughout the land can now be resumed with vigor and zeal. We purpose to take the five great Protestant denominations in turn and suggest plans to bring together in a compact army, the ministers and laymen who see great peril to the cause of God in the assaults of false scholarship upon the authority of the Word of God.

As The Bible League is interdenominational, we propose to create a Council in each of the following cities, in which we already have a nucleus: Boston, Providence, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis and St. Paul, St. Louis, Kansas City, Des Moines, Louisville, Los Angeles. The Council will be composed of the subscribers and patrons in the cities named and their near neighborhood. A simple organization for local purposes will thus bring into touch with each other all who will actively engage in the aggressive work of the league. THE CHAMPION will serve as a medium of communication between the General Office and the various Councils. It will also be made the chief campaign agent of the league. In each city the local Council, by securing names and addresses of leading ministers and influential laymen, can have sample copies go to each. This will create public sentiment, arouse personal interest and win financial support.

We solicit the cooperation of friends of generous means to make this campaign possible and effective. If THE CHAMPION could reach a circulation of 100,000, the advertising would become a valuable aid in the maintenance of our work. One hundred persons who could each contribute $100 or more, to this campaign fund would enable us to start an immediate campaign in the cities named above.

The General Secretary will confer with our friends in these cities and where it is desirable and practicable will meet them in person and arrange for the opening of the work. A copy of THE CHAMPION will be sent to many who have been reported to us as in sympathy with the purposes of the league, who may be induced to aid in such manner as their means and other obligations will permit. Communications addressed to the General Secretary soliciting information or offering cooperation will receive prompt attention. May we not urge the pledge of help by a large number who will contribute at once?

WM. PHILLIPS HALL,
President of the Bible League.

"You will find among scientific men very few who attack either theology or religion. The attacks imputed to them are made, for the most part, by those who, with a very scanty knowledge of science, use, not its facts, but its most distant inferences, as they do whatever else they can get from any source, for the overthrow of religious beliefs."—*Sir James Paget.*

The Continent-wide Campaign can begin at once if each Subscriber will get another. DO IT NOW!

THE LIBRARY TABLE.

"Christian Faith in an Age of Science"*---A Review.

Prof. L. D. Watson, Ph.D., LL.D.

Genesis and Geology.—Part 3.

In discussing "Genesis and Geology," the author seems to think Moses made many mistakes, and the greatest mistake of all is the claim that Moses wrote the book of Genesis. The professor says: "We must now consider the effect of the discoveries whose history we have sketched in regard to the antiquity of the earth and of man, upon the interpretation of the Bible and upon the doctrine of the inspiration and authority of the Bible. And first our attention is demanded by the supposed narratives of the Creation in the first two chapters of Genesis, and the bearing of geological science upon their interpretation. Any one who will read the first two chapters of Genesis in any other than a casual and perfunctory way, can readily recognize that they contain not one but two narratives of the Creation." Perhaps we do not understand what the author means by reading in a "casual and perfunctory way," but we would say that for over forty years we have carefully read and taught these two chapters in Hebrew, and critically studied them in the light of the various sciences bearing upon their authorship and meaning, and yet we fail to see "that they contain not one, but two, narratives of Creation." We have been able, however, to "recognize" that the first Mosaic chapter, included in the first thirty-four verses of Genesis, contains a narrative of the *fact* of Creation and the following twenty-two verses contain a narrative of the *mode* of Creation. A man who is not able to read a word of Hebrew, but who has a moderate amount of literary instinct and who has not become color blind by living in a geological cave, could see that Moses, in introducing his second chapter says: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created." It would seem that even a geologist should be able to see that Moses shows in this sentence, that the term "created" refers to the *fact,* while the term "generations" alludes to the *mode* of producing the fact. It will be observed that Moses, in this second chapter proceeds to show how things were made. The author says: "There is no reasonable doubt that the two narratives were written at different times and by different persons." We would remind our readers that this is simply an assertion. All we need to say is, there is no reasonable doubt that the two narratives were not written at different times and by different persons. Here the author drags out the old musty rationalistic straw and threshes it over again without producing a grain of truth, if, indeed, it ever had a grain in it. From a literary standpoint there is no evidence that Genesis was written by different authors and at different times. He further says: "There is at present, among those who are competent to have an opinion on the subject, substantial unanimity in the belief that the Book of Genesis is a composite structure, containing fragments of documents of various ages which a later editor collected into the present composition." The truthfulness of this statement has never been proven and there is no likelihood that it ever will be; as archæological discovery is all against it. But if it should ever be proven it would not affect the genuineness, authenticity and authority of the book. As well say: There is at present, among those who are competent to have an opinion on the subject, substantial unanimity in the belief that the History of the United States is a composite structure

* *Christian Faith in an Age of Science.* Prof. William North Rice, Ph.D., LL.D.

containing fragments of documents of various ages which a later editor collected into the present compilation. But even if this History of the United States "is a composite structure," it does not follow that Bancroft did not write it, and although it can easily be proven that Bancroft's History of the United States is a "composite structure" and does contain "fragments of documents of various ages," yet it does not follow that it is not a true and authentic history. None of the Bible writers claim that they originated any of the ideas that they recorded, for if they had, the book would be human and good for nothing.

The claim is that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." It would make no difference where the "Holy Ghost" got these facts which he revealed to Moses. The only question is, Are they true? The author further says: "The two narratives present characteristic differences of language. One such difference may be mentioned, as showing itself conspicuously even in the English translation. In the first narrative the Deity is constantly called 'God'; in the second he is as constantly called 'the Lord God.'"

In this quotation the professor has brought out the old rationalistic "chestnut" which has been so often discussed. These names are about the only "characteristic difference of language" in these two chapters. We are glad the author has alluded to this matter of language, as it shows the weakness of his theory. To any one holding the position, as the professor does, that each of these chapters refers to the fact of Creation, it certainly would seem strange that different names should be used, but when, as we have seen, the first chapter refers to the fact of Creation and the second to the mode of Creation, the difference in name is not only reasonable but necessary. In the first chapter, the name God was used for the Deity as absolute Creator out of relation with creation and especially with man, but after creation, the name Lord God was used to express God as conditioned and in relation with man.

It is important to observe that the name God occurs in the first verse of the creation chapter and the name Lord God in the first verse of the generation chapter; the first expressing unconditional relation, the second expressing conditional relation.

Again he says: "The comparison of the two narratives reveals important discrepancies, or, at least, differences between them. The first narrative makes the work of creation occupy six days, the second speaks of the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." Had the professor paid a little attention to the Hebrew text he would have seen no discrepancy, much less a contradiction, as the "day" here expresses simply the "terminus a quo." Again we read:

"The first narrative makes man the last work of creation; the second makes the creation of man precede that of plants and animals." This error results from the error in assuming that both chapters refer to the creation of man. Having stated the order of creation in the first chapter, the inspired author does not repeat that exact order in the second chapter, but simply states the fact in regard to Adam's relation to the animals and his naming them. Evidently the professor is a better geologist than a lawyer.

The professor further says: "The first narrative implies the simultaneous creation of a plurality of human individuals—'male and female created he them'; the second describes the making of a single male individual out of the dust of the ground, and the subsequent making of a single female individual out of a rib taken from the body of the man." Here the author falls into a similar error in assuming that both chapters refer to creation. In the twenty-seventh verse of the first chapter we have a statement that expresses the fact of a creation of a plurality of human individuals—'male and female,' but it does not imply their "simultaneous creation."

In the second chapter, in harmony with its purpose, the author states how each was created.

Again the author says: "The first narrative presents the history of creation as a continuous progress from lower to higher forms of existence, in which each stage is pronounced 'good' in its time and order; the second gives us a procedure involving

experiment and after-thought—the creator being represented as saying that it was not good that the solitary man he had made should be alone, then proceeding to make the various members of the brute creation, finding among them no 'help meet' for the man, and at last making a woman to supply the desideratum."

The first part of the statement is correct, but the second part is an error. The confusion of ideas is not in the record, but in the mind of the professor. He falls into the same error as in the preceding statement and for the same reason.

Lastly, in this connection, the author says: "The first narrative conceives the whole process of creation from a quasi-evolutionary point of view—'Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit.'—'Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life.'—'Let the waters bring forth cattle and creeping things, and the beast of the earth after his kind'; the second gives a procedure in the style of the 'Carpenter God' of the old natural theology, the Deity being represented as manufacturing animals and man out of the dust of the ground, planting a garden, and extracting a rib from the man for the fabrication of a woman." All this confusion and error arise from not distinguishing the formation of the second chapter from the creation of the first.

There was nothing inconsistent in the Creator being a "Carpenter" any more than there was in the Redeemer being a "Carpenter." It is unbecoming in a Christian professor sneering at either one. We think the professor's fundamental blunder is in the assumption that Moses was giving an account of the creation of the first or celestial universe rather than the creation of the second or mundane world.

Miracles.

We come now to the author's discussion of miracles. He says:

"It is indeed unnecessary to spend time in proving that a miracle is possible." We are surprised at this concession, as it clearly contravenes the theory adopted in this book. The uniformitarian principle of evolution excludes the possibility of a miracle in any scientific, not to say theological sense. The moment an evolutionist concedes the possibility of a miracle, he grants all that any theologian claims, as it provides for involution which opens the way for special creations at any point along the line of evolutionary progress. Again he says: "The limitation of miracles to three great series marking respectively the Mosaic, the Prophetic and the Christian dispensation in the history of revelation finds its most reasonable explanation in the belief that miracle forms a part of the divine plan of revelation and that each of the great critical stages in the development of a progressive revelation has been marked by more or less numerous miracles. The acceptance of this conclusion by no means requires us to accept as historic all the miraculous narratives of the Old Testament or even of the New Testament." We are not sure what the professor means by "miraculous narratives," but if he has faith enough to accept the "narratives" as "miraculous," he ought not to find it difficult to accept the contents of these "miraculous narratives."

He says again: "It is altogether probable that legendary elements in considerably large degree are mingled in the Old Testament history, and in less degree even in the New Testament history. Each miraculous narrative in the Bible, then, must be subject to a distinct critical investigation." At this point of course the professor claims to be "wise above what is written," and proposes to assume the role of Biblical theologian and by critical skill determine which are historical narratives and which are mythological narratives. The professor has undertaken a large contract and we are curious to know whether he will make good his purpose. If he succeeds he will accomplish something that no one else has ever been able to do, though many have tried. Having paid his respects to the "mistakes of Moses" he now points out at least one thing which he claims to be a mistake of Joshua. He says: "As an illustration of a miracle which seems to have very little claim to acceptance as a historic

fact we may take the case of the sun and moon standing still in obedience to the word of Joshua. It is enormously improbable a priori that the rotation of the earth was suspended in order that Joshua might have a few more hours of daylight wherein to slaughter a few more of the Amorites. Only on very strong evidence could such an allegation find credence." After writing over a page more on this "miraculous narrative," he leaves the historic statement just where he found it. At some period and in some form, the "sun and moon" must have been standing still. Some where and at some time they must have been started. Why could they not have been stopped and started at this time? From a rational standpoint the only question would be an adequate motive. As the subjugation of these heathen peoples involved the whole Messianic question the reason must have been much greater than "to slaughter a few more of the Amorites." The professor claims that there are grades of evidence in miraculous facts. As an illustration he cites the birth and resurrection of Christ. He says: "I do not say that the miraculous birth is not a historic fact. A strong argument may be made for its historic truth. But the evidence in its favor is incomparably less strong than the evidence for the resurrection; and, with perfect consistency, a critic may believe that the resurrection is a historic fact, and the miraculous birth a legend."

We do not think this illustrative comparison a very happy nor accurate one, for while the Bible writers doubtless regarded the resurrection as miraculous, they never, so far as we know, considered the "birth" of Christ as miraculous. We think it safe to "say that the miraculous birth is not a historic fact," simply because there was no "miraculous birth," and further we may regard "the miraculous birth a legend," but the "virgin conception" was certainly "miraculous." In proceeding, the author says: "The critical mind can hardly escape the feeling that a few of the miraculous stories in the life of Jesus have something of a legendary aspect." As a matter of fact it may seem strange to the professor, nevertheless it is true that the great majority of the most critical scholars and the most profound scientists in the annals of history did "escape the feeling that a few of the miraculous stories in the life of Jesus have something of a legendary aspect." As an illustration, the author says: "The story of the piece of money that Peter found in the mouth of the fish has a grotesque aspect quite different from that of most of the miracles of Jesus; and a person of scientific and critical habit of mind cannot easily believe that a legion of devils actually entered into a herd of swine." Over against this sentimental opinion it is only necessary to say that its weakness is seen in the fact that the great majority of the most accurate scientists and the most profound thinkers of "critical habit" do "easily believe" both of these historic statements. Of course infidels cannot "easily believe" them, for they lack the moral ability. The author says: "Some miracles can be very confidently accepted. A critical examination of others seems to require their rejection as unhistorical." From this statement we see that the professor claims that any man is at liberty to run through the Bible and say what is and what is not true. It is plain that the author thinks he could write a more correct Bible than the one Christ accepted and preached from. Where then was the wisdom of God in giving man a Bible when he could make a better one himself? The author says: "There can be no more pernicious teaching than that which is offered by many good men in the most devout spirit and with the best motives — the teaching that all the miracles of the Bible must stand or fall together." We think the professor's horizon is entirely too contracted. The question is a much larger one than simply whether "all the miracles of the Bible must stand or fall together." The real question is whether "all the miracles of the Bible" and the Bible itself "must stand or fall together." We think they must.

Conclusions.

1. This review completes a brief examination of the main positions in Professor Rice's book entitled "Christian Faith in an Age of Science." Like the modern delusion

known as "Christian Science," it contains many things that would not indicate either "Christian Faith" or "an Age of Science."

2. The geological scientist is the last man to attack the theological scientist. Theology is the oldest of all the sciences and the cerebrum of the intellectual cosmos. In an important sense theology is the only science —all the other sciences being simply departments of this one great knowledge. Geology is still in its infancy, and, according to evolutionary speed, it will be a long time coming to manhood, if indeed, it ever reaches that state. As yet, it is little more than a theory, and should be very modest in its claims.

3. This volume of over four hundred pages, instead of being a fresh, vigorous and up-to-date presentation of vital scientific truths, is rather a paleolithic strata of fossilized ideas. The author uncovers little or no new truth, and therefore adds little or nothing to our common stock of knowledge.

4. This book is weak in scientific analysis and skilful synthesis. It is greatly wanting in scientific discrimination and philosophical classification. Where we should expect to find clear, scientific deductions, we meet with confusion and obscurity. All the sciences, or in better words, all the knowledges, whether physical, psychical or spiritual, should have their due relation around the heliocentric science of the eternal God.

5. While we do not presume to call in question the fact that Professor Rice is in possession of all the facts of geology so far as they are known by the most intelligent geologists of the present day, yet we think many of the parts and most of the whole of this book is very illogical. In some connections, it would seem as if the author had never heard of a man by the name of Aristotle. Surely if some of his premises were infected with mental smallpox, the conclusions would be in no danger of being intellectually contaminated.

6. This is an age of specialists in all departments of knowledge. Life is too short and our means too limited to become critically accurate and thoroughly proficient in all the sciences. We think the author unfortunate in attempting the role of the theologian. It is at this point where he appears to the greatest disadvantage. It is one thing to read the rocks, but quite another to read the Bible.

7. As a geologist, and especially as a biologist, the author has entirely too much faith. Where there are no facts of any kind to support the uniformitarian theory of evolution, especially in regard to the question of the "origin of life," he seizes upon naked faith and rests his case upon mere belief. If the author had as much faith in the Bible as he has in evolution he would put to shame many of our greatest theologians.

8. A man who is not a critical linguist, especially a skilful Hebraist, should be slow in making an attack upon the writers of the Bible. In discussing the first two chapters of Genesis, the professor betrays a sad lack of the usus loquendi of the Hebrew language. Otherwise he never would have stumbled over the term "yom." But much more than a mere critical knowledge of Hebrew is necessary to constitute a sound and thorough Biblical exegete.

9. The most important qualification for a Biblical exegete is spiritual insight. No amount of intellectual knowledge can be substituted for spiritual perception. Paul expresses a profound truth when he says: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Moral purity is the medium of spiritual sight. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

10. We admire that rare commodity known as brains wherever we find it, even if it is exhibited in an attempt to turn the truth into an error, as was the case with Hume, in discussing the question of miracles, but we soon weary with a rehash of old, exploded scientific theories and philosophical speculations. This book is largely devoted to a resume of the various scientific theories which were once held, but have long since been abandoned; thus showing the mutability of "science falsely so-called."

11. In reading this volume, we cannot escape the impression that the author was entirely too far under the domination of

self-consciousness. We admire a bold and positive writer, but when he fails to make any new discoveries or does not succeed in presenting old truths in new lights and relations, we think he should write with becoming modesty and deference to other departments of science.

12. We have "swung around the circle" of the sciences, and after much critical thought and careful investigation, we have come to the conclusion that the Bible is the most scientific book ever written or that ever will be written. This goes without saying, as it is the word of God, and he is the Infinite Scientist. Even the author admits that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

13. We think it entirely inconsistent in a professedly Christian teacher, in a Christian university, to charge the Christ as being unscientific. He says: "So strongly was the unscientific mind in former ages possessed by the idea of the spontaneous generation of new life out of the decay of old life that even the normal processes of vegetable reproduction were misinterpreted as cases of spontaneous generation. It was, for instance, the common belief that a seed buried in the ground died, and from its death was evolved a new life of the growing plant. In one of the most touching and beautiful of all the discourses of Jesus, we find a figurative passage based upon this popular misinterpretation of the facts regarding the germination of seeds: 'Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but, if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.' Of course we are in no wise disturbed by the recognition of the scientific error involved in this figure."

Paul says: "Christ in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Strange that Christ being possessed of all knowledge—science—should fall into a scientific error." But instead of this statement being a "scientific error," it is a plain fact containing a great scientific truth based upon the science of vegetable biology.

14. This book is well calculated to do an immense amount of damage. In our judgment it does not contain enough "gray matter" to make any special impression upon a "mature mind," but it will surely exert a baleful influence upon the young and immature mind. It cannot fail to destroy the faith of young people in the Bible. The ratio of this harmful influence will be in proportion to the confidence in and respect for the professor.

15. There is a wide difference between skepticism and infidelity. Skepticism is the result of defective knowledge and belongs to the head, while infidelity is the lack of faith and belongs to the heart. There are some things that can neither be proved nor disproved but must be accepted by faith. The Bible being a reasonable record must be received by faith. Paul believed the record of Moses and said: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God." To reject the statements of the Bible is infidelity.

16. For our acceptance the author gives a fair presentation of the old rationalistic theories long since cast upon the skeptical junk-heap. If, by these skeptical speculations, the author should succeed in destroying the faith of the young people in the Bible, *cui bono?*

COUNTERFEIT CRITICISM OF THE SCRIPTURES

Rev. Jay Benson Hamilton, D.D.

Address Before the Methodist Ministers, New York City.

36 pages, paper, sent post-paid, 10 cents.

"As a clear setting forth within a short compass of the dangers of Higher Criticism and the attitude of Methodism, properly interpreted toward it, we have seen nowhere any discussion that will at all compare with this one."—*New Orleans Christian Advocate.*

"The author's text is 'Show us,' and it will be seen that he does not preach *from* the text, but sticks closely to it. The address is up-to-date and is among the best, if not the very best, paper of its kind and purpose we have seen. It is clear, concise, cogent, complete, conclusive, and should have a wide circulation."—*Prof. L. D. Watson, LL.D.*

Professor L. T. Townsend's Books

"Devoted to those inquiries which now agitate the thinking world."—*Radical*

"The aim of these books, as is well known, has been to show the reasonableness of the Evangelical Christian doctrine. Persons sceptically inclined should, therefore, read them."—*Publisher's Announcement.*

All Books below may be ordered from the BIBLE LEAGUE Office.

Credo, Arena and Throne, God-man, Sword and Garment, Supernatural Factor in Revivals, Bible Theology and Modern Thought. The publisher's price for each of these books is $1.50. Arrangements are now made by which they can be secured at 75 cents, postage prepaid.

The following Lectures can be obtained at 10 cents each. One of the Number has reached a sale of 15,000 copies.

Doctrine of the Trinity (48 pages); New Theologies, Only Bubbles (64 pages); Collapse of Evolution (54 pages); End of the World, Biblical and Scientific Points of View (62 pages); Bible Inspiration, (108 pages).

The following Sermons at 8 cents each:

Final Judgment; The Disreputable Woman and her Conversion; Temptation; Righteous without Knowing It; God and the Nation; Penalty of Unrighteousness; More Unrighteousness; Paul's Cloak, or Consecration; God and the Islands of the Sea; Manifest Destiny; Esther, or the Wise Venture; John the Baptist, or the Ministry, Christ Approves.

These books have been reduced to the price given:

Satan and Demons, 35 cts.; God's Goodness and Severity, 35 cts.; Adam and Eve. History or Myth, 35 cts.; Deluge, History or Myth, 45 cts.

Bible Studies, Part 1, Rules of Interpretation; Part 2, Current Difficulties Found in the Bible (89 pages), 15 cts.

The following Books and Pamphlets will soon be in the hands of the publishers: Anastasis or the Blessed Life; The Stars are not Inhabited; A Place of Punishment Called Hell.

Editions of the following list of Dr. Townsend's Books are exhausted. Efforts are making to re-issue them.

Lost Forever; Intermediate World; Fate of Republics; Faith Work, Christian Science and Other Cures; The Bible and Other Ancient Literature; Art of Speech, Vol. 1, Studies in Poetry and Prose; Vol. 2, Studies in Eloquence and Logic; Mosaic Record and Modern Science; Evolution and Creation; What Noted Men Think of Christ; What Noted Men Think of the Bible; True and Pretended Christianity; Chinese Question; Outlines of Christian Theology; Elements of General and Christian Theology; Failure of all Attempts to Destroy or Remodel Bible Theology; Re-embodiment of the Dead; God is Where He Was.

Address,

BIBLE LEAGUE, 317 EAST 118th ST. NEW YORK CITY